


The University of Chicago
Libraries



ARCHBISHOP DAVIDSON
AND THE ENGLISH
CHURCH



ARCHBISHOP DAVIDSON

THE
ARCHBISHOP DAVIDSON
AND THE ENGLISH
CHURCH

BY
SIDNEY DARK

Author of 'Five Deans,' etc., etc.

New York
WILLIAM MORROW & COMPANY

TO
SARAH BELL OGDEN

BOX 5199

11 25 13

First Published in 1929

Printed in Great Britain

INTRODUCTION

ARCHBISHOP DAVIDSON is, as it seems to me, a great man, greater, perhaps, in purity of character, in steadfastness of purpose and in achievement, than any of his contemporaries who have been prominent in the government of the English Church or the English State. Every experienced journalist who, during the past twenty-five years, has been admitted, thanks to his profession, behind the scenes, and has met men, whom crowds acclaim, *en pantoufles*, must have been tempted to write a book with the title, *The Infinite Littleness of the Great*. But the life of Archbishop Davidson suggests no such temptation. With him there has never been petty personal ambition, readiness to compromise principle, or truckling to the mean in high places. His long life has been a life of service, and, in the ecclesiastical statesmanship with which he has been intimately connected, he has been concerned to retain those qualities of the Church of England which have appeared to him to be essential, if it is to play the part which, again as it seems to him, a national Church should play. To

understand Dr. Davidson's statesmanship, it is necessary to understand that he is convinced that the Church of England must remain comprehensive and established, that he regards the establishment as of first importance for the nation even more than for the Church itself, and that he is convinced that establishment cannot continue unless the Church is widely comprehensive, finding a place within its fold for the three types of Churchmanship that have dwelt together in more or less amity since the Reformation settlement.

It is quite impossible for a writer who does not share the Archbishop's ideals to write of his policy without frequent criticism, and such incidental criticism as occurs in the following study of his great career is in a sense dictated by a vastly different conception of the character of the Church from that which the Archbishop himself holds. I have suggested the qualities of greatness which are apparent in Dr. Davidson. One thing he has always lacked. That is audacity. In secular affairs, it is audacity that spells victory. That is not likely to be forgotten in an age that has produced Lenin, Mussolini and Mustapha Kemal Pasha. But the Apostles were far more audacious, and so were many of the saints. In

the Archbishop there is a good deal of Fabius and nothing of Danton. He has always been an intense believer in the power of negotiation, and his failures are to be attributed to the fact that he has rarely found other men with the 'sweet reasonableness' which he himself possesses.

But it is a very great figure that has passed from the centre of the ecclesiastical stage—a strong man, sincere, steadfast, perhaps limited in sympathy, certainly incapable of always understanding the significance of novel movements and unusual demands, but never failing in his eagerness to serve the nation and the Church. That is the man whom I have endeavoured to describe in the following pages.

I have made no attempt at a comprehensive biography, and I have had no access to any private or unpublished papers. I have to express my gratitude to my friend, Canon S. L. Ollard, for reading my proofs and for very helpful criticisms.

SIDNEY DARK.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. THE APPRENTICESHIP . . .	I
II. THE EIGHT YEARS AT WINDSOR .	29
III. THE FOUR YEARS AT ROCHESTER .	53
IV. BISHOP OF WINCHESTER . . .	81
V. THE BEGINNING OF THE PRIMACY .	110
VI. FRANK WESTON, KIKUYU AND DR. HENSLEY HENSON . . .	134
VII. THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND AFTER	152
VIII. THE SERVANT OF THE STATE . .	165
IX. THE LAST FIVE YEARS . . .	188
X. ' INTO THE CORRIDOR OF LIFE'S EVEN- TIDE '	237
INDEX	245

CHAPTER I

THE APPRENTICESHIP

IN April 1877, Thomas Randall Davidson, a young Scottish clergyman, who for three years had been a curate at Dartford, Kent, drove through the gates of Lambeth Palace to take up his position as chaplain-secretary to the Scottish Archbishop.

Mr. Davidson was just twenty-nine. When he went for the first time to Lambeth, Stanley had been Dean of Westminster for fourteen years and Church had been Dean of St. Paul's for six years; Liddon was at the height of his fame as a preacher; Pusey was to live for another five years and Newman for another twelve years; Dr. Gore had recently been elected a Fellow of Trinity, Oxford, Mr. Davidson's college, and the present Bishop of London had just gone up from Marlborough to Keble; the Archbishop of Canterbury was a schoolboy and the Archbishop of York was not born.

When Mr. Davidson began his official career, the life of the Church was overshadowed by the

Public Worship Regulation Act. When he returned to Lambeth in 1903 as Lord Archbishop, the life and practice of the Church of England had been revolutionised by the Lincoln Judgment.

It is commonly believed that the Public Worship Regulation Act was the result of the Protestant agitation led by Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Cairns, who were the Sir William Joynson-Hicks and the Sir Thomas Inskip of fifty years ago. But, as a matter of fact, the Public Worship Regulation Act, devised specifically 'to put down Ritualism,' did not go far enough for Lord Shaftesbury, who regarded Ritualism, with 'its mischievous trumperies,' as of secondary importance. It was the Confessional that disturbed him, and he was eager that the Church should be cleansed of this 'foul thing.'

The Queen and Archbishop Tait were solely responsible for the Act, which Littledale accurately described as 'the most unstatesmanlike statute of modern times.' The Queen, whose Presbyterian heart had been outraged by the growing influence of the Tractarian movement, urged the bishops to draw up the Bill, and her persistence ensured its passage into law. She wrote to Tait in January 1874: 'It is clear that the state of the Church, the liberties taken and the defiance

shown by the clergy of the High Church and Ritualistic party, is so great that something must be done to check and prevent its continuation.' Disraeli was indifferent. His Cabinet was divided. But Tait warned him—anticipating Mr. Rosslyn Mitchell—of the danger of affronting the Protestant feeling of the country, and the Queen commanded compliance. Of course, Disraeli obeyed. When the Act was passed in August, the Queen was fervent in her thanksgiving for the defeat of 'that party that has done so much to undermine the Church, and to poison the minds of the young and of the higher classes, a party for which the Queen cannot deny that she has the greatest abhorrence.'

The Court constituted by the Public Worship Regulation Act soon got to work. It was presided over by Lord Penzance, whose long experience as a divorce judge appears to have been his peculiar qualification for deciding ecclesiastical suits. Four months before Mr. Davidson arrived at Lambeth, the Rev. Arthur Tooth, of St. James's, Hatcham, was sent to Horsemonger Gaol for defying Lord Penzance's findings. Father Tooth was released after fourteen days, but among Mr. Davidson's first duties as Archbishop's secretary was to carry on a long correspondence

with the recalcitrant priest, who dared to suppose that it was his duty to obey the Ornaments Rubric in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI rather than an Act of Parliament which had never received the approval of Convocation. The correspondence, said the *Guardian*, was 'like the play of a palace cat with a church mouse.'

Other cases followed. In the year of Davidson's appointment, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council declared the use of wafer bread for Holy Communion illegal. Vestments and the eastward position were condemned, and, in the three years that followed, three other clergymen went to gaol, one of them, the Rev. S. F. Green, of Miles Platting, staying there for a year and seven months. Tait was then a dying man, and perhaps because his heart had softened or perhaps because, with his Scottish common sense, he realised the futility of persecution, he did all that he could do through Davidson to get 'poor Mr. Green' out of gaol; but both Green and his persecutors were uncomfortably earnest and honest. 'No existing authority, ecclesiastical or civil, will ever cause me to assent to the proposition that "shall" is equivalent to "shall not,"' wrote Green to Davidson. And it was only through the constant pressure of the Lord

Chancellor that the Bishop of Manchester at last applied for Mr. Green's release, and the scandal of 'the continued imprisonment of a clergyman of the Church of England not charged with any criminal offence' came to an end. The long and bitter persecution of Mr. Mackonochie, of St. Alban's, Holborn, proceeded throughout Davidson's years of office as Archbishop's chaplain. It was brought to what seemed, but was not, its end by Mackonochie's exchange of livings with Mr. Suckling, of St. Peter's, London Docks, shortly before Tait's death. 'It will, I feel sure,' wrote Davidson, 'be a satisfaction to you to know what a pleasure your letter has brought to the Archbishop in these his last days, as it would seem, on earth.'

The story of Archbishop Davidson's life has been the story of the attempt of the authorities of the Church of England first to destroy and, when that was found impossible, to control the Catholic revival. That was the main business with which he was concerned as Tait's chaplain. Before Tait died, in 1882, it was plain that the Public Worship Regulation Act was a ridiculous failure and that Lord Penzance, with all his knowledge of divorce, was powerless against men of faith and conviction. Tait was an unqualified

Erastian. He was born a Presbyterian and in essentials remained a Presbyterian. He detested Catholic practices as thoroughly as Queen Victoria detested them. But even Tait was compelled to realise that the Catholic movement could not be destroyed by direct attack, and his much younger secretary must have been convinced that persecution can be of no avail.

Much happened between the death of Tait and Randall Davidson's succession to the Primacy. Much more has happened during the past twenty-five years. But the Archbishop's official life has ended with the preoccupation with which it began. Anglo-Catholicism has grown immensely stronger and more influential, and the one object of the revision of the Prayer Book was to check and crib it. To this end, the Archbishop has spent the amazing vigour and courage of an undaunted old age. He has brought to the task a knowledge, a sympathy and an experience of which Tait knew nothing. But he has failed, as Tait failed. 'Discipline' has still to be secured. Obedience has still to be obtained. The problems incidental to a comprehensive Church have still to be solved.

Good fortune, as well as character and ability, has played its part in the lives of most successful men, and certainly good fortune was conspicuous

in the early years of the Archbishop's great career. Tait and the Archbishop's father were school-fellows at the High School, Edinburgh, and their friendship was unbroken for fifty years. After Harrow, where at that time Westcott, the great Bishop of Durham, was a master—in his schooldays George Russell described the future Archbishop as 'a pink-faced youth with blue eyes'—Randall Davidson went up to Trinity College, Oxford. Craufurd Tait, the Archbishop's son, was at the same college, and the two Scottish young men, sons of two old friends, naturally became intimate. They were ordained together at St. Mark's, Kennington, by the Bishop of Dover in 1874. Randall Davidson was naturally a constant visitor at Lambeth and Addington, where, until the time of Dr. Temple, the Archbishops of Canterbury had their country home, and, as the Archbishop himself has said: 'It was not a great surprise to me that when Craufurd, who had been acting for a year as his father's confidential chaplain, resolved to give up the post, the Archbishop invited me to take his place.' The three years at Dartford that preceded the appointment, during which he showed splendid courage and energy during a smallpox epidemic, were the only parochial experience that Dr. Davidson has ever had. The good fortune that

had brought him to Lambeth certainly continued when, a year afterwards, he married the Archbishop's second daughter.

Randall Davidson's health was bad. He had been wounded by a gun-shot in his last year at Harrow, and the result was that he was compelled to spend two winters abroad during his time at Oxford. He read for Honours in Law and History, but he broke down during the examination. He was, however, given a third class on the strength of the papers that he had presented.

The problem of discipline and the prolonged controversy with the Anglo-Catholics have been the troublesome preoccupations of Dr. Davidson's primacy, and the knitting together of the Anglican communion throughout the world, with the vast extension of its episcopacy and its activities, has been its greatest achievement. And here again he received an early apprenticeship for successful work. In 1878 the second Pan-Anglican Conference met at Lambeth. The first had been called by Archbishop Longley in 1867. It had met during the Colenso controversy, and Tait had then declared that he thought 'the Romeward tendency more dangerous for our clergy than the tendency towards free thought.' There were far greater fears of Rome and Romanising at the 1878

Conference, and, though there was an attempt to prevent doctrinal discussion, the subject of Confession was too much in the public mind to be ignored.

Sacramental Confession, preached by the Tractarians since the beginning of the movement, is of course taught in the Book of Common Prayer, but its revival stirred the Protestants of last century to fury. The English bishops condemned the Tractarian teaching in 1873, and the hundred bishops at the Lambeth Conference five years afterwards agreed that an Anglican priest was not authorised 'to enjoin or even to encourage the practice of habitual Confession to a priest.' The Tractarian position with regard to Confession is explained in a letter of Liddon's. He says :

'The Church of England *offers* the relief of Confession before Communion to those whose consciences tell them that they need it. She gives no authority to her clergy for *insisting* on Confession as a necessity before Communion. If a clergyman expresses a wish that people would use Confession, it does not necessarily follow, I suppose, that he says that they *must* use it. Everything, indeed, turns upon the exact language which is employed : but the line

between the *offer* of Confession, if felt to be needed, and the compulsory enforcement of it, is plain enough. The latter is the system of the Roman Church ; but a clergyman may say that he thinks Confession a good thing before Communion without saying that it is a *sine qua non*. It is, as I have said, a question of the terms employed.'

Liddon's opinion is now accepted even by the Erastians. In his recent judgment in the Capel St. Mary case, Sir Lewis Dibdin, the successor of Lord Penzance in the Court of Arches, agreed that an Anglican priest may encourage the practice of habitual Confession, and has power to grant absolution. He justified what the hundred bishops condemned just fifty years ago.

At the Lambeth Conference of 1878, Randall Davidson made his first acquaintance with the Church overseas. It was the distinction of Tait's primacy that he was the first Archbishop of Canterbury who could see beyond the two English provinces. He 'made Lambeth a centre and rallying-point for the whole of Anglicanism.' He began the work that his son-in-law has carried on. Since his day, the successors of St. Augustine have been the acknowledged heads, with wide,

if ill-defined, moral authority, of a world-wide religious communion. Mr. Davidson heard discussions at the Conference concerning the relations between the Church of England and Rome and with the Old Catholics. He listened to the settlement of the constitutions of the West Indian dioceses. The ex-Dartford curate looked out on the world !

This year—1878—was a year of sorrow for the Tait family. Craufurd Tait died in May, and his mother died in December during her daughter's, Mrs. Davidson's, honeymoon. The Archbishop was sixty-seven. He was a stubborn, self-assured man, but he never recovered from the loss of his wife and son. He came to depend more and more on his son-in-law, who had all his confidence, and the softer and wiser mood of the last five years of the Archbishop's life must to some extent have been the result of Davidson's influence. Tait was responsible for the appointment of the Royal Commission to enquire into the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts. He was its chairman, and, though it has been suggested that its condemnation of the existing harsh system, published after Tait's death, would have been different if he had lived, his son-in-law has himself declared that it was in accord with the Archbishop's own judgment.

In the years from 1878 to the Archbishop's death in 1882, Mr. Davidson was concerned with the Burial Bill, with all sorts of overseas complications and the never-ceasing ritual troubles, with the kindly efforts to get 'poor Mr. Green' out of prison. He was the power behind the throne, though he was little known outside Lambeth. His only recorded public appearance was at the Church Congress at Derby just before Tait's death, when Benson commented: 'The best speech was Randall Davidson's—among happy illustrations was "The shillelagh-loving theological critic of the Church papers, who dashes in hitting freely on both sides and all round him, piously ejaculating, 'God grant that I may be fighting on the right side.'"' About this time Dean Wellesley of Windsor—as Queen Victoria described him, 'the last of my four intimate and confidential friends'—offered Mr. Davidson the position of Sub-Almoner, 'both as a mark of respect to the Archbishop and because the young man is most highly esteemed.'

It was to Mr. Davidson that the Archbishop gave his last confidences. 'He had a very anxious feeling with regard to his successor, but one which he would not allow to be communicated to Mr. Gladstone, lest it might in any way embarrass

him. "God," he said, "has placed in his hands the responsibility, and with him it must rest." 'The Queen made daily enquiries during Tait's last illness, and it was his death that brought Davidson to the notice of the royal lady with whom he was to be so intimately associated. Wellesley died three months before the Archbishop, and this event was the occasion of Davidson's first letter to the sovereign. He wrote :

' The Rev. Randall Davidson to Sir Henry Ponsonby.

' Addington Park,

' 19th September, 1882.

*' MY DEAR SIR,—*I am directed by my father-in-law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to express to you the very great sorrow with which he has this morning received the intelligence of the death of his own old friend, and her Majesty's privileged and trusted servant, the Dean of Windsor.

' The Archbishop wishes me, through you, to express his great regret that owing to his illness he is unable to have the honour of himself writing to her Majesty to express his deep and respectful sympathy.

' The Archbishop is, thank God, making fair

progress towards recovery, but there are many drawbacks and minor complications, and some time must elapse before we are relieved from anxiety, even if complete recovery is to be granted. I have the honour to remain, my dear sir, yours very truly and dutifully, RANDALL T. DAVIDSON.'

When Tait himself died, the Queen wrote in her diary :

' WINDSOR CASTLE, 1st December, 1882.—Had a touching letter from J. Ely, who had seen the dear Archbishop [Tait], and he wrote down before her the following words: "A last memorial of twenty-six years of devoted service. With earnest love and affectionate blessing on the Queen and her family." The writing is almost illegible except in the signature. How I should have liked to see that holy deathbed, and to have received his blessing! He was quite conscious, but hardly expected to live till morning. J. Ely said he looked so handsome, and not as if he were so near his end. He said, "God bless the Queen and her family. My last thoughts are for her and her children. God bless them all. The Queen has ever been so kind to me." How touching!

'3rd December, 1882 (*Advent Sunday*).—
Heard to my grief that the dear, excellent
Archbishop breathed his last at 7 this morning.
His wife died on the 1st of December, '79,
also an Advent Sunday. His loss is immense.
Few, if any Archbishop, certainly not in this
country, has been more respected and beloved,
or performed his difficult, arduous task more
admirably, calmly and dispassionately, than
he did, for the last fourteen years. He will
be universally regretted. All creeds and de-
nominations respected and liked him. He spoke
extremely well in the House of Lords. Both
he and Dean Wellesley were at Osborne in
August for the confirmation of my grandsons,
their last act! Telegraphed to the poor
daughters. Service at 12, performed by Mr.
Blunt, who, preaching well, alluded very
touchingly to the Archbishop.'

Years afterwards, his son-in-law said of Tait :
'His primacy, whatever else it did, had taught
men to realise better the practical power of the
Church of England as a force, an incomparable
force, for God and good. He broadened its basis
in the national life. In the words of his
epitaph, drawn by the master hand of Dr.

Vaughan, and inscribed in the transept behind me :

Wise to know the time and resolute to redeem it,
He had one aim ;
To make the Church of England more and more
The Church of the People.'

The death of a patron is the end of the careers of many faithful servitors. But Tait's death added immensely and immediately to Dr. Davidson's influence. He had had seven years of preparation. He had been behind the scenes, learning the characters of the men who mattered in Church and State, acquiring knowledge of the working of the complicated Anglican system. While Tait lived, Randall Davidson was just Tait's chaplain. With Tait lying dead, he stepped from the background to the centre, or almost to the centre, of the stage, to be first a king-maker and soon himself a king.

When Benson succeeded Tait as Archbishop of Canterbury, it was generally believed that it was Mr. Gladstone who was entirely responsible for an appointment that suggested the abandonment of the policy of the Archbishop's predecessors. Tait, as has been said, was a Presbyterian who never understood the significance of the Oxford

movement. He may have tried to get 'poor Mr. Green' out of prison, but a lunatic asylum must have seemed to him the proper place for 'poor Mr. Green' and all his friends. Tait was an Erastian. Benson was—I quote his son—'an ecclesiastic born. Everything ecclesiastical—stately buildings, historical traditions, dignified ceremonial, solemn music—appealed to him from childhood.' In addition, he was a learned liturgiologist, and, Mr. A. C. Benson adds: 'In advanced ritual he took a fearful joy.' Benson was not a Tractarian. In matters of doctrinal belief he was certainly not a Catholic. He was almost morbidly anti-Romanist. He belonged to that not inconsiderable party in the Church of England that loves all ritual that has no particular significance. But when he went from Truro to Canterbury, he was recognised as a definite High Churchman, and it was due to Randall Davidson, to the unbeneficed clergyman far more than to the Prime Minister, that a High Church prelate succeeded his own Low Church father-in-law.

Dean Church was Gladstone's first selection, but Church was unwilling to leave the Deanery of St. Paul's for anything 'except retirement altogether from public office.' Harold Browne,

the Bishop of Winchester, was the prelate whom Tait would have chosen. Bishop Browne wrote himself on 17th December, 1882: 'The Archbishop in his last interview with me very shortly before his death expressed and repeated to me his earnest hope that I should succeed him. The Archbishop wrote to me to beg me not to decline the offer, if made.'

On 4th December, Randall Davidson wrote a letter to Lady Ely for submission to the Queen :

'The Archbishop has naturally had many conversations with me, in these last solemn weeks, about his successor. The two men to whom he has looked forward with the greatest hope have been the Bishop of Winchester and the Bishop of Truro. The latter has been much with the Archbishop of late, and has enjoyed his full confidence and repaid it richly. In the probable event of his being thought too young to become; for the present at least, Archbishop of Canterbury, my dear father-in-law has hoped and prayed that the Bishop of Winchester might be his successor. Though old, he is comparatively strong. I made a private memorandum of the Archbishop's words on the subject spoken to me last Thursday week.

They were as follows: "I should be truly thankful to think it certain that the Bishop of Winchester would succeed me at Lambeth. He could do more than any other man to preserve the Church in peace for its real work against sin. I pray God he may be appointed, and may accept the call."

'You will, I think, agree with me that these words are almost too important for me to be justified in keeping them to myself, but if you think it better they should go no further I shall, of course, entirely acquiesce. They were spoken, as I have said, not as comparing the Bishop of Winchester's real powers and merits with those of the far younger and more vigorous Bishop of Truro, but on the strong supposition that the bound from Truro to Canterbury would be by some considered too sudden a one.'

On the next day the Queen wrote her first letter to Mr. Davidson, thanking him for the 'beautiful account of the last days and hours of the beloved Archbishop.' On 9th December, Davidson was at Windsor. He was seen, and he conquered. The Queen wrote in her diary that she had seldom been 'more struck than I have been by his personality,' and she concluded:

‘We went over various topics, and I feel that Mr. Davidson is a man who may be of great use to me, for which I am truly thankful.’ They discussed Tait’s successor, and the Bishops of Winchester and Truro were both considered. Davidson suggested: ‘The former was rather old, but would command the respect and acquiescence of all the bishops. The Archbishop had seen him several times during his illness, also the Bishop of Truro, and had had a great deal of conversation with him and entered most fully into his views and plans. The Bishop of Truro, Mr. Davidson said, was a man of singular power, firmness and at the same time gentleness.’

On the 11th the Queen saw Gladstone. As a High Churchman he naturally favoured Benson, but any nomination of Gladstone’s would be suspect. In a letter to him on ‘the alarming Romanising tendencies’ of the clergy, written in January 1874, the Queen said: ‘The Queen must speak openly, and therefore wishes to say that she thinks this especially necessary on the part of Mr. Gladstone, who is supposed to have rather a bias towards High Church views himself, but the danger of which she feels sure he cannot fail to recognise.’ The Queen, indeed, has herself made it clear that it was Mr. Davidson and not

Gladstone who convinced her that Benson and not Browne should go to Canterbury. In recording her interview with Gladstone, she says: 'I then said what a very high opinion Mr. Davidson had of Bishop Benson, and observed that I thought the former an admirable and charming person, thoroughly acquainted with everything concerning the Church and the clergy, to which Mr. Gladstone responded, saying he had, no doubt, a career before him.'

When an Archbishop's chaplain may nominate an Archbishop he may well be expected to go far. Dr. Browne was certainly too old. He was over seventy, and Gladstone discovered that no Archbishop of that age had been appointed for two hundred and twenty years. But Dr. Browne did not consider himself too old. 'If the offer had been made,' he wrote, 'I should have had to consider seriously whether I could decline it or not.'

Gladstone wrote a kindly letter to Dr. Browne, and Mr. Davidson was sent by the Queen to explain the situation. He reported that the Bishop of Winchester was 'really stronger at the moment than he had been for some time past.' All that he suffered from were occasional 'severe colds.' But he was seventy-two, and his wife admitted that

his strength and vigour were likely to grow yearly less. 'I tried to explain to Mrs. Browne,' Mr. Davidson continued, 'as fully as I could, the actual character of the work done during the course of the year by the late Archbishop.' And, in the circumstances, it is unlikely that the strenuousness of the work was understated. But Mrs. Browne was apparently unconvinced. 'Mrs. Browne is unable to form a clear opinion as to the bishop's physical capabilities for the post, although on the whole she would look hopefully to his being able to do it.' Mr. Davidson made it clear that he disagreed with Mrs. Browne, and he added : 'Nor would it be right for me to lead your Majesty to suppose that the late Archbishop, before expressing the private opinion which has been communicated to your Majesty and to Mr. Gladstone, had given special and minute consideration to the *physical* qualifications or disqualifications of the Bishop of Winchester for the work of the primacy.' He went on :

'The Bishop of Winchester is probably the only bishop whose presidency (were his health known to be equal to it) would fall in with the general wish of the entire episcopate. His gentle wisdom and unobtrusive learning have

long commended him, in a marked degree, to all the bishops, even to those who would naturally be most afraid of his supposed High Church views. I have again and again had opportunity of observing the respect with which his views have been received on subjects where the difference of opinion has been marked.

‘Next to him, in the view of the episcopate, would undoubtedly stand the Bishop of Durham. His position is so unique a one, and his reputation in certain fields so unrivalled, that, with two dissentients only among the bishops, I believe he would be received with emphatic favour as their chief.

‘The Bishop of Truro would, as I believe, stand next in episcopal favour. He is only a few years younger than the late Archbishop was on his appointment to the primacy, and I cannot recall a single instance, either at a Lambeth meeting or in Convocation, in which he has met with anything but cordiality and admiration from the assembled bishops. The Archbishop often spoke to me of his sudden access to episcopal favour and reputation. But undoubtedly there are three, or probably four, bishops who would feel hurt and angry at his appointment to the primacy; and this it would take all

CD

his remarkable geniality and grace and goodness to overcome.

‘ I have felt it my duty, Madam, to endeavour, to the best of my ability, to answer frankly the important question your Majesty did me the honour of putting to me. I cannot find words to express the natural diffidence I feel on being thus called upon to give, however humbly, an opinion on matters involving such momentous issues. Your Majesty’s most gracious letter left me, however, no alternative, and I have tried, in humble reliance on the guidance of Almighty God, to answer your Majesty’s questions by as plain and simple a statement as possible of what I believe to be the truth. I have the honour to remain, Madam, your Majesty’s most obedient humble servant,
RANDALL T. DAVIDSON.’

Mr. Davidson had only had a few weeks’ experience of Queen Victoria, but his letter is a miracle of deftness. Disraeli himself could not have more astutely contrived to influence the royal lady.

Mr. Davidson very properly considered that Bishop Benson, even then his ‘ close friend,’ was the best man for Canterbury. His advice was taken, and three days later Gladstone wrote to

Benson offering him the preferment. Before deciding, Benson asked Mr. Davidson to come to Truro, and he once more reported to Windsor :

‘ The bishop, should he accept the primacy, as no doubt he will, is kindly anxious that I should continue to hold, under him, the post of Archbishop’s chaplain and private secretary, and I have, under the circumstances, felt it my duty to assure him of my readiness to do so, at least for a time, and to endeavour to aid him in every possible way. I ventured to tell the bishop that I had reason to think your Majesty would be glad that he should accept the post, and perhaps I may be permitted respectfully to say that, if it should seem good to your Majesty to telegraph to him to Truro to the same effect, it would, while greatly encouraging him for his work, doubtless lead to his immediately signifying his acceptance of the high office. His feeling of personal devotion to your Majesty is a marked feature in his character. . . .
RANDALL T. DAVIDSON.’

The Queen was delighted. She wrote to the Archbishop-elect : ‘ The Queen has heard with great satisfaction that Mr. R. Davidson is (for the

present at any rate) to give him his valuable assistance in the same position which he held with his beloved father-in-law. The Queen has just had a letter from the Dean of Westminster, in which he speaks of the bishop and Mr. Davidson in the warmest terms.'

Benson was fifty-three. He had not before sat in the House of Lords. He had little knowledge of what his son calls 'central affairs.' And Mr. Davidson was of the greatest possible service to him. Mr. A. C. Benson says :

'Though their natures were very dissimilar, they became united by the most intimate and devoted friendship. The present Bishop of Winchester had been brought up in a very different school of Church feeling ; he had been influenced, under the auspices of his father-in-law, in the direction of sagacious statesmanship, and of individual and national rather than ecclesiastical Churchmanship. His knowledge of public men, of the world, of organisation, of Church legislation, of ecclesiastical movements, was of inestimable value to my father ; moreover, he was intimately acquainted with the *personnel* of the Church, and had the whole of the intricate business of which the Primate is the centre at his fingers' ends.'

The Archbishop-maker remained at Lambeth as

the new Archbishop's chaplain for only a few months. In May 1883, on the death of Dean Connor, he was offered, and accepted, the Deanery of Windsor. The Queen wrote in her diary : ' Have just received Archbishop's answer : name Carpenter and Davidson to him. His opinion of the latter is so excellent, so suited to my requirements, that have asked him to [enquire] if he would accept. Says youthfulness not the slightest objection. As soon as get answer will communicate, and you can inform Mr. Gladstone.'

Gladstone, who apparently had no great enthusiasm for the royal nominee, wrote to Sir Henry Ponsonby :

' MY DEAR SIR H. PONSONBY,—Since Hamilton telegraphed to you on my behalf this morning, I have had your answer, and I will certainly write to Mr. Davidson.

' I should have submitted my scruple on the score of age to her Majesty, had I not been estopped by the heavy artillery she was pleased to bring into the field, which reduced my little point to dust and ashes. I suspect, however, that, when the operation is completed, some of the critics will be, as it is said, " down upon me."

' There is no doubt, I think, that Mr. Davidson

will be generally an excellent dean. Believe me,
sincerely yours, W. E. GLADSTONE.'

And Benson wrote in his diary: 'Went with Davidson to see the Queen and his deanery. . . . The Queen said to-day, "As I get older I cannot understand the world. I cannot comprehend its littlenesses. When I look at the frivolities and littlenesses, it seems to me as if they were all *a little mad*." She said, too, "The wickedness of people's spite against one another is so great." Davidson's simple and comforting frankness will be a great strength to her. She desired him not to leave me until the summer: "Let the *canons* work, let the *canons* work."'

So finished the years of apprenticeship. In five years the Scottish curate from Dartford, with little scholastic distinction, had become the confidant of the sovereign, the adviser of prelates, the maker of the princes of the Church. It was said at the time: 'Davidson has gone to Windsor as a nuncio, but not of Peter.'

CHAPTER II

THE EIGHT YEARS AT WINDSOR

ARCHBISHOP TAIT thought of himself as primarily the servant of the sovereign and the State. Benson, with a chivalrous devotion to his sovereign, thought of himself as primarily the chief minister of the Church, and, at the time of the one great event in his primacy, he claimed for himself, by right of his office, to be the supreme judge in matters that affected the life of the Church. Randall Davidson inherited the Tait tradition. Through his personal relationship with Tait he became the intimate and trusted adviser of the Queen. Nevertheless, as has been shown, it was largely due to him that Benson came from Truro to Canterbury and an Erastian tradition was upset.

The two men were on terms of close friendship while Benson was still Bishop of Truro and Randall Davidson was the Archbishop's chaplain, but that fact alone does not entirely explain why Randall Davidson's great influence was exercised to secure the throne of St. Augustine for his

friend. The softened mood of Archbishop Tait, during the last four years of his life, was obviously largely due to the fact that his chaplain and son-in-law had realised that persecution was a failure, and, in consequence, it must have seemed to the chaplain that the well-being of the Church demanded that the next Archbishop should be a definite High Churchman, though, of course, with no papist nonsense about him. It was once wickedly said of Dr. Randall Davidson that he was a very good man without any principles. As a matter of fact, from the beginning to the end of his career, Dr. Davidson has had one evident and single purpose—to ensure that the Church of England shall continue comprehensive and established. Unless it were comprehensive, the Church would break into half a dozen fragments, none of which would have any greater influence than any of the Dissenting sects. Unless it remained established, it could not play its proper part in the national life. When Tait died, disruption was threatened by the prosecutions that followed the Public Worship Regulation Act. Far-sighted wisdom, therefore, decided that the prosecutions should cease. On the other hand, the unchecked growth of Ritualism appeared, fifty years ago—as it appears to some people

to-day—to make disestablishment inevitable, and a safe High Church Archbishop might reasonably be expected to contrive the cessation of mischievous persecution and to act as a check on the eccentric vagaries of the ‘Romanising party’ in the Church. So Dr. Benson went to Canterbury, and, soon afterwards, Mr. Davidson went to the deanery at Windsor.

To Queen Victoria, the Dean of Windsor was the principal ecclesiastical member of her household—a clerical adviser and major-domo. When Connor was appointed dean in 1882, the Queen wrote that the deanery required ‘a tolerant, liberal-minded, Broad Church clergyman who at the same time is pleasant socially and is popular with all members and classes of her household; who understands her feelings not only in ecclesiastical but also in social matters; a good, kind man without pride.’ The sovereign had no patience with pride in her servants.

It is to be presumed that the Queen found in Mr. Davidson all the necessary qualifications. The affectionate terms on which he remained with his royal mistress is shown in an entry in Benson’s diary in 1888. Just after the Lambeth Conference, Benson was summoned to Balmoral, and the Dean of Windsor was among

the other guests. The Archbishop wrote: 'The Queen looked exceedingly well and was very gracious—and her little quick *naïvetés* and her *nods* were very bright.—The Dean of Windsor was not well—"He works too much—I think this Archbishop Tait's *Life* tries him—and *your*——" she said smiling. I said, "Conference, Madam?"—"Exactly."'

The *Life* of his father-in-law which Mr. Davidson wrote in collaboration with Canon Benham was begun soon after he went to Windsor, and was published in his last year at the deanery.

In the spring of 1883, the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill was introduced into the House of Lords. The Prince of Wales was a steady supporter of the measure, and regularly voted for it, and the Queen, who apparently shared her son's opinion, was very anxious that the Archbishop should not speak against the measure even though he felt compelled to vote against it. Her view was conveyed through Mr. Davidson to Dr. Benson. But Benson was far more a Churchman than a courtier, and he regretted that he was unable to keep silence. 'It is not merely that he feels strongly about it personally,' Randall Davidson wrote to Sir Henry Ponsonby, the Queen's private

secretary, 'but he feels too that he is looked on as the natural mouthpiece of very many others, and that he ought not to refuse to give expression to what is, I suppose, the practically unanimous view of the clergy as well as of so many of the foremost and most loyal of the laity.'

Dr. Davidson's own view of the question is set out in a long and learned letter to the clergy and laity of the diocese of Canterbury, published in 1907, after the Deceased Wife's Sister Act had become law. Marriage with a deceased wife's sister was now legal as a civil contract. But it was still prohibited by the Canons of the Church as being contrary to God's law. Many of the clergy felt bound to refuse to celebrate such a marriage in church, and, in words of extreme caution, Dr. Davidson agreed that they were right. 'I believe,' he wrote, 'that they, the clergy, will act wisely and rightly in saying that such marriages, when they take place, ought to take place elsewhere than in church.'

But he was careful that it should be understood that he was only expressing a pious opinion. 'I wish it to be clearly understood that my advice is advice only, and not a formal direction or injunction. I have not, to the best of my belief,

any legal right, and I certainly have not any wish, to exercise authority in the matter. The law has given a discretion to the incumbent. If, after carefully weighing the whole circumstances, he decides that he ought to perform the marriage, or to allow it to take place in the church whereof he is the responsible minister, I shall in no way regard him as disloyal or disrespectful, because of the decision to which he has come. By clergy in my own diocese I have been definitely applied to for advice, and I have given it. If to the friends of the new law it is unpopular, there is the more reason for my enabling a parish priest to quote my words for his own protection.'

The strength of the Church of Rome is that it is always logical and consistent. The weakness of the Church of England is that its comprehensiveness prevents it from being logical, and its establishment makes consistency impossible. If marriage with a deceased wife's sister is, as the Canons assert, contrary to God's law, then clearly such a union cannot be a sacramental marriage, and its celebration by a priest in church is a blasphemous mockery. But Dr. Davidson, while recognising the canonical prohibition, refused to do more than deprecate the mockery. 'Do not be hard with these misguided people,' he said, in

effect, to the clergy. 'Do not marry them if you can help it, but advise them to go to the registrar or to the Methodist chapel round the corner.'

To the question, 'Can marriage with a deceased wife's sister be a sacramental marriage?' Dr. Davidson by implication answered 'No.' To the further question, 'Are persons so married to be regarded as being in sin, and therefore to be denied the Sacraments of the Church?' he answered with a very emphatic 'No.'

'But another question will speedily arise; indeed, it has already shown itself above the horizon. How ought the clergy, in the exercise of their ministerial responsibility, to regard those who have legally contracted these marriages since the passing of the Act? Many who so marry will claim the ordinary privileges and ministrations of the Church. Are these to be withheld? I have no hesitation in saying that, from men and women who are otherwise entitled to receive these privileges, they ought not in my judgment to be withheld on the mere ground of such a marriage.'

The whole position is hopelessly Erastian. It assumes that sacramental marriage and civil marriage are equally valid. Dr. Davidson was

Archbishop when he wrote this opinion, a servant of the State as well as the head of the English Church, and it is not unfair to add that King Edward was on the throne.

While his first concern, as Dean of Windsor, may have been to minister to the Queen and the royal household, his continued intimacy with Benson kept him in close touch with general ecclesiastical affairs, and the letters that passed between him and the Archbishop prove that his indirect influence was very considerable.

Dr. Davidson's own primacy has been marked by an ever-increasing cordiality, in which optimists see the promise of inter-communion and reunion, between the Anglican Church and the Eastern Orthodox and the other smaller Churches of the East. The *entente* began during Archbishop Benson's reign. He was particularly interested in the woeful condition of the Assyrian Christians, the remnant of the great Nestorian Church that at one time stretched right across Asia to China, whose sufferings have been intensified since the Great War. It is interesting, in view of more recent events, to know that in 1891 it was owing to Dean Davidson that the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge made a contribution of £500 to the mission which the

Archbishop sent out to aid this heroic and ancient Church.

The year 1888 was the year of the third Lambeth Conference, which was attended by one hundred and forty-five bishops. During its sittings the Dean of Windsor was in constant consultation with the Archbishop, and it was he who drew up the official report. Benson records, 'The Bishop of Gloucester said that in all his experience of editing he had never known such a feat as Davidson's in having the account of the Conference all ready and printed and published in five days.' Truth to tell, while the bishops from the ends of the earth probably enjoyed themselves immensely at Lambeth, their discussions do not appear to have been of any very great importance, and perhaps the Queen, with unconscious sarcasm, summarised its only practical result when she wrote: 'The Archbishop will have had the opportunity of making many interesting acquaintances.'

In 1889 the Protestants were again on the war-path. Lord Grimthorpe threatened to introduce a Bill into the House of Lords strengthening the penal clause against recalcitrant clergy. Writing to Randall Davidson as 'My dearest Dean,' Benson said that he had told Lord Grimthorpe

that Gladstone would not let such a Bill pass the Commons, and that the Protestant champion replied that Gladstone's power was waning and that 'the Commons would pass it with a rush if a Protestant feeling was awakening.' This communication has a particular interest in view of the Protestant fervour of the House of Commons during the past two years.

In 1890, Westcott, who, it will be remembered, was a master at Harrow when Davidson was a boy there, was appointed Bishop of Durham. Here again it is fair to assume that the Dean of Windsor, in close and almost daily association with the sovereign, had not a little to do with persuading her that Westcott was the ideal man to succeed Lightfoot. 'I entirely agree with you in the immense importance of the selection for bishoprics,' the Queen wrote to Benson in January 1890. 'It is a great anxiety, and the men to be chosen must not be taken with reference to satisfying one or the other party in the Church, or with reference to any political party, but for their real worth. We want people who keep firm and conciliatory, else the Church cannot be maintained. We want large, broad views, or the difficulties will become insurmountable.' Admirable sentiments, and curiously unlike the violent

Protestantism of the Queen's letters to Tait. The monarch had evidently come under the dean's 'softening' influence.

The outstanding event of the primacy of Archbishop Benson was the trial of Bishop King of Lincoln, and the judgment delivered in the library at Lambeth Palace in November 1891 remains one of the most important events in the modern history of the English Church. In considering the career of Archbishop Davidson, and the part that he has played in shaping the destinies of the Church, the interest of the Lincoln Judgment lies in the fact that he, perhaps more than any other man, was in close and constant consultation with the Archbishop from the beginning to the end of the famous cause. For twenty-five years Dr. Davidson has been recognised as the dominant personality in the English Church, but, for many years before his primacy, his influence, sometimes direct and sometimes indirect, was far greater than was generally known. Archbishop Benson himself acknowledged his indebtedness to the dean. In 1880 he paid tribute to his 'constant helpful friendship,' and that helpful friendship was obvious throughout the Lincoln case.

In 1888, the Church Association presented a petition to the Archbishop in which it was alleged

that Dr. King, Bishop of Lincoln, had been guilty of illegal ritual acts, and the Association begged the Archbishop to put his suffragan on trial. It was doubtful whether the Archbishop had any power to sit as supreme ecclesiastical judge in a court constituted by himself, and the Catholic party persistently denied that such power existed. With a vigour and force of language in strange contrast to the mildness of its tone to-day, the *Church Times* denounced the Archbishop for abrogating to himself the power of an English Pope, and when his judgment was delivered, while it welcomed the findings, it denied that they had any canonical force. The Archbishop himself was doubtful. But he realised that, if he declined to sit as his judge, the Bishop of Lincoln might be cited before a secular court the jurisdiction of which neither he nor any other Catholic would recognise. The bishop would almost certainly be condemned in default, and trouble would be vastly aggravated. The Archbishop, therefore, 'after much consultation, especially with the Dean of Windsor,' was content to declare that he had 'failed to satisfy himself that he had jurisdiction without some instruction being produced from a competent court.' The prosecutors then appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council,

which declared that the Archbishop had jurisdiction, and, in a letter to the dean, the Archbishop said that he felt unable any longer to refuse to hear the cause. He drew up a memorandum on why it was necessary to proceed, and—further evidence of Dr. Davidson's importance—he noted that 'Davidson thinks the memorandum conclusive.'

On 4th January, 1889, Dr. King was cited to appear before his Metropolitan. Benson wrote to Davidson: 'When a horse bolts downhill, it is safer to guide than to stop him, especially by getting in front of him. Would it had never begun! But that is such a different thing.'

The Archbishop's continued dependence on the dean is shown in a letter written in October, in which he says, 'I am thankful you are coming to-morrow, and hope you will be able to come in good time. I shall much want to know what you think of many things.'

I summarise the seven offences with which Dr. King was charged:

1. Mixing water with the sacramental wine during the service, and subsequently consecrating the mixed cup.
2. Standing in the 'eastward position' during the first part of the Communion Service.

3. Standing during the prayer of Consecration on the west side of the table, in such manner that the congregation could not see the manual acts performed.

4. Causing the hymn *Agnus Dei* to be sung after the Consecration prayer.

5. Pouring water and wine into the paten and chalice after the service, and afterwards drinking such water and wine before the congregation.

6. The use of lighted candles on the Communion table, or on the retable behind, during the Communion Service, when not needed for the purpose of giving light.

7. During the Absolution and Benediction, making the sign of the Cross with upraised hand facing the congregation.

The illegal practices were said to have taken place in Lincoln Cathedral and in the parish church of St. Peter-at-Gowts, Lincoln. After certain preliminary skirmishes, the trial began in Lambeth Palace on 4th February, 1890. The Protestant prosecutors were represented by Sir Horace Davey, afterwards a most learned judge, and, I believe, the last counsel to quote Latin in his addresses to the jury ; Dr. Tristram, an ecclesiastical lawyer of eminence ; and Mr. Danckwerts, a counsel as celebrated for his brusque manners as for his

knowledge, who was also a perfervid Protestant. Bishop King was represented by Sir Walter Phillimore, now Lord Phillimore, and the then Mr. Jeune, and there is a certain irony in the fact that one of the counsel for a Catholic bishop should have afterwards become a divorce judge.

Archbishop Benson's comments on the learned counsel were exceedingly acute. 'Sir Horace Davey,' he wrote in his diary, 'came in not knowing the difference between the first and second Books of Edward VI or much else of his brief. But he took up quickly what he ought to say and said it incisively.' And at a later date he wrote: 'Phillimore is learned and quick and delights to believe himself *omnidoct* and *omnidocent*.' Members of the council of the English Church Union have reason to know that in his honoured old age Lord Phillimore still believes himself *omnidoct* and *omnidocent*.

The Archbishop was assisted by Temple, Bishop of London; Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford; Thorold, Bishop of Rochester; Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury; and Atlay, Bishop of Hereford. The proceedings lasted until 25th February. The Archbishop reserved his judgment, which was not delivered until 21st November.

On the first charge the Archbishop found against Dr. King. Mixing water with the wine during the Communion Service was, in the English Church, one 'of the accustomed ceremonies which be put away.' The Archbishop found in the bishop's favour as regards all the other charges except the last, declaring that the signing of the Cross at the Absolution and Benediction was 'an innovation which must be discontinued.' In the final words of his judgment, the Archbishop sternly condemned the proceedings of the Protestant societies which had been busy initiating Ritualist prosecutions. He declared that 'it is not decent for religious persons to hire witnesses to intrude on the worship of others for purposes of espial.' He expressed the view that such cases as those which he had been obliged to hear diverted the Church from the 'real contest with evil and building up of good.' And he added: 'The Church therefore has a right to ask that her congregations may not be divided either by needless pursuance or by exaggerated suspicion of practices not in themselves illegal.'

The Archbishop was pleading for the middle way which the authorities of the Church of England have always favoured, and for which Dr. Davidson has striven throughout his life.

Comprehensiveness was to Dean Stanley the one great virtue of the English Church, and in reading Archbishop Benson's judgment it is impossible not to realise his eagerness to retain comprehensiveness almost at any price. Soon after the judgment was delivered, the Archbishop wrote to the Dean of Windsor: 'If comprehensiveness is not to be the policy henceforth, but uniformity, and if this uniformity only means sameness in external particulars, there must be a change of ministry, I think.'

The prosecution appealed against the Archbishop to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and on 2nd August, 1892, the Judicial Committee dismissed the appeal, upholding the Archbishop in every particular, though as regards the altar lights they found that the bishop could have no responsibility in the matter, because it was the incumbent of the church and not he who had lighted the candles. A typical finding! It is said—and I admit I can find no authority for the statement—that, before Benson had consented to hear the case, he had received from the Lord Chancellor an assurance that in any circumstances his judgment would be upheld. But, whether this is so or not, the finding of the Judicial Committee was of immense importance, because the judges reversed their own former decisions and

accepted the principle that the Judicial Committee is not necessarily bound by its previous judgments.

The Lincoln Judgment is the most important event in the history of the Church of England from the beginning of the Oxford movement until the introduction of the revised Prayer Book. It was regarded at the time, both by Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals, as a High Church victory. The Evangelicals found some comfort in the fact that the Archbishop had decided that there was no un-Protestant meaning in established Catholic practice. The general opinion of the Tractarians was expressed in a passage in *The Life and Letters* of Dean Church: 'The delivery of the Archbishop's judgment took place in November, and its character and contents brought the dean the last flash of happiness before the end. It seemed to come to him with a touch of reassurance and confirmation in that steady trust in the English Church which would not let itself be overthrown by the disasters of 1845.'

After the judgment, the *Church Times* still emphatically declared that the court had no canonical authority, and that the Archbishop was expressing nothing more than his own individual opinions. None the less, it expressed the opinion

that his decision, confirmed by the Judicial Committee, 'had closed the epoch of ritual prosecutions.' That was to a large extent true, and the impression of the judgment at the time is certainly still the view of informed ecclesiastical opinion. It remains one of the key events in Archbishop Davidson's life, and it is necessary for my purpose to emphasise his own connection with it. Benson, and Benson alone, was responsible for the form of the judgment. He was, as I have said, a learned liturgiologist, which his successor has never been. It was suggested at the time that Stubbs had partly written the judgment, but, in his *Life* of his father, Mr. A. C. Benson says that, while the Archbishop had advisers, he had no collaborators. The Dean of Windsor was foremost among the advisers. Mr. Benson writes : ' Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Westcott were in accord with him on the main issues ; Dean Davidson was in this matter, as in so many, his intimate friend and counsellor.'

When the Lincoln Judgment had been delivered, Archbishop Benson and his wife went to stay at the Windsor Deanery, and at the conclusion of the visit the Archbishop wrote to the dean : ' I can scarcely realise what you and Edie have been to us all this week. You and your house and your

surroundings form one perfect picture of soothingness and help, out again of which you start as the living hearts that give meaning to all the rest, and are all the rest too.'

Dr. Davidson's own view of the Lincoln Judgment was expressed in November 1892, after he had become Bishop of Rochester. He said to his Diocesan Conference :

'Three months have elapsed since the Court of Appeal delivered final judgment in the case of "Read *v.* the Bishop of Lincoln." I must not pass over in silence a matter in which so wide an interest was shown by all sorts and conditions of men within the Church of England, but I have neither the historical learning upon these subjects, nor, to tell the truth, the vivid enthusiasm on one side or other about their precise details, which would justify or encourage me in going *seriatim* through the several points which were at issue. Rather my thankfulness for the result arrived at is due in part to the hope that these minutiae of ritual will now be regarded as even less suited than before for public and unlearned correspondence on the part of Churchmen in general ; that they will fall, in short, into their proper and proportionate place among Church questions ; and that our very reverence for the solemn subject they encircle

will be felt to justify us in discussing them less often and less hotly than of old, and in loyally entrusting their due regulation, when occasion calls for it, to those in whose hands the authority really lies.

‘ If this be indeed the result, I am very sure that hundreds of the most devout of English communicants will close, with a sigh of thankfulness, this curious page of our Church’s history. You will not, I am sure, misunderstand me. I am not underrating the vital importance of having such controversies, when they do arise, set at rest by due authority, at whatever expenditure of time and thought. For the present, let us hope and believe they have now been duly set at rest—so far as litigation goes—for ever ; and let us turn to other and (may I say it in all reverence !) larger things upon which the Lord Jesus Christ is calling us to concentrate our energies and to spend our span of life.’

Like Gallio, Dr. Davidson cared, and still cares, for none of these things. ‘ Minutiæ of ritual ’ are of small importance. Within reasonable limits, he would have every man be religious in his own way.

The permissions of the Lincoln Judgment have been exploited to the full. The prohibitions have been entirely disregarded. That is characteristic

of the history of the Church of England during the past fifty years. Since 1892 no clergyman has been prosecuted for taking the eastward position, for performing the Ablutions, for lighting candles on the altar, or for causing the *Agnus Dei* to be sung at the Service of Holy Communion. On the other hand, the mixed chalice is the rule now in moderate churches, and making the sign of the Cross at the Absolution and Benediction is the common practice of clergymen whom bishops delight to honour. It is, by the way, suggested that this last practice was forbidden to a bishop and not to a priest, a technicality that may have its significance. The Judgment has, indeed, considerably stimulated Catholic practice. It is impossible to believe that Tait would have subscribed to his successor's findings. It is a matter of great interest that the findings were arrived at after constant consultation with Tait's son-in-law.

The years 1883 to 1891, during which Dr. Davidson was Dean of Windsor, were crammed with public events of outstanding importance. Gordon was killed at Khartoum, Gladstone was converted to Home Rule, the Liberal Party was disrupted, and many important Acts of Parliament were submitted to the Queen for her consent. They included the Contagious Diseases Act, the

Married Woman's Property Act, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and an Act enlarging the parliamentary franchise. They were unhappy years for the Queen. The death of Gordon filled her with horror and anger. 'The Government is alone to blame,' she wrote, 'by refusing to send the expedition till it was too late.' She was emphatic in her opposition to Irish Home Rule, and her mistrust of Gladstone was so great that she personally intervened in political intrigue to prevent him again becoming Prime Minister.

Dean Davidson was constantly with the sovereign. It is not to be supposed that he was directly consulted on secular affairs, but he must always have known the Queen's mind, and it is permissible to believe that he must on many occasions have suggested a measure of caution. There are records, indeed, that when other counsellors had attempted in vain to influence the royal lady, who was never very easy to move from a purpose which she had determined, the dean's aid was invoked, and that he often succeeded where others had failed. He was still little known to the great world. He remained behind the scenes, but within the Church his influence grew more considerable year by year. Outside the Church his importance was recognised

by his election as a Trustee of the British Museum and a Governor of Eton College. These were the small things in the busy life of the dean who was the close counsellor of both Queen and Archbishop.

Dr. Davidson's health in these Windsor days was still troublesome. He tired easily, and when, in due course, preferment was offered to him, he dreaded undertaking more strenuous work, and he had little inclination to leave the pleasant, interesting life of the Deanery of Windsor.

CHAPTER III

THE FOUR YEARS AT ROCHESTER

IN September 1890, Lord Salisbury, the then Prime Minister, offered the Dean of Windsor the vacant bishopric of Rochester. The Archbishop wrote to him :

‘ DEAREST DEAN,—I must not go to bed without telling you how I thank you wonderingly for giving no less fullness of attention to my affair, even at so critical a moment, than to your own—you take my *syllables* as peaceably as if you had nothing to dwell on, and nothing to feel. But what a momentous moment it is ; and I only fear lest you should think I take it too quietly.

‘ There is no doubt, and there can be none, that for your own spirit it is a tremendous change. I am praying earnestly that the call may be full of power. Do not fear that if you could change your “ Great ones ” for Poor—far more than you have the least chance of doing—you would lose a tittle of influence in

the Kingdom of God. *They* won't suffer you to drop them—yet it is a wonderful mark that He should after all call you from those *slippery* associations to the poor of His People.

'But He does. Now, for a time—and the time will be rich in the end.

'Your ever affectionate,

'EDW : CANTUAR :'

The appointment was denounced as a job, but Lord Halifax, with whom in the 'nineties Dr. Davidson was little in sympathy, pointed out that if the dean had cared only for ease and a career he would have stopped in his deanery.

'*They* won't suffer you to drop them' obviously referred to the Queen and the Royal Family, and the continuance of the Dean's connection with the Court was soon assured. When he became a bishop he was appointed Clerk of the Closet to the Queen.

Not without regret and not without hesitation, Dr. Davidson decided to exchange Windsor for the Kennington Road. Both he and his friends were seriously and properly perturbed by his health. The Archbishop wrote to him: 'To counsel you to work less and send you such work is hypocritical, so I say boldly, Work less for

everybody but me.' Three weeks afterwards Benson wrote: 'I hear with sorrow from dear Lucy that you are not well and full of the future. Do be discreet in sitting up and in exercise, and do not mind so much the duty of answering the long and incessant letters of selfish friends—especially one who oft reproaches himself and does not amend. All will go well—never fear—diocese, house, and all. All will work out. All will be blessed.'

Dr. Davidson was consecrated ninety-ninth Lord Bishop of Rochester in Westminster Abbey in 1891. Dr. Butler, the Master of Trinity, preached the sermon, and after the service the new bishop was presented with a chalice by a number of clergymen with whom he had read for Holy Orders with Dr. Vaughan, the famous Master of the Temple who had become Dean of Llandaff. The new bishop's health broke down, and it was not until the following October, after 'the long summer quiet of a sick-room,' that he was enthroned in Rochester Cathedral. During his illness he stayed for a while at Osborne Cottage, which was lent him by the Queen. 'Most thankful to hear of real and distinct improvement,' wrote Archbishop Benson in May. 'May He carry it on steadily and swiftly in His beautiful mercy.'

But if you take too anxious thought for the morrow, even in spirituals, He will not be able. Healing second, peace first.' A fortnight afterwards, the Archbishop wrote: 'I trust you are daily repairing yourself a little and feel it. It is gardening you want. I am gardening—that is, creeping about a garden like an old gardener, and driving between whiles, and it is eminently refreshing. You had really better be off soon to a garden with a doctor's lamp next door. It is the name of the doctor combined with the facts of the hedgerow which works changes.'

The bishop might well be appalled by the difficulties of a diocese which only a strong man could possibly successfully administer. The ancient diocese of Rochester included the whole of the present diocese of Southwark, which was constituted in the second year of Dr. Davidson's primacy. It stretched from the outskirts of Maidstone westward to Kingston, with the vast straggling district of South London, with its congeries of mean streets, at its centre. In the days before motor-cars it was a matter of immense difficulty for the diocesan to visit all the parishes, and it was not unnatural that, troubled by his health, and doubtless realising his handicap in having little experience as a parish priest,

Dr. Davidson should have considered resigning his post almost immediately after his consecration. He was, however, quite certain that the bishop must live, not only among his people, but among the poorest of them. That was the obligation of a chief pastor of a National Church. He said in an address to his Diocesan Conference :

‘ The nature of my illness has not called for banishment from home, and I have thus, although a prisoner, been in hourly touch with those on whose capable and willing shoulders the work devolved, and whose activities I was debarred from sharing. I am increasingly certain that in our strangely constructed diocese the bishop’s home should be at its busiest centre, and I thank God for the decision now happily made that there, in the very heart of South London, is to stand the permanent home of the diocesan. I have considered well the weighty and tempting arguments in favour of a country home—a Bromley, a Danbury, a Selsdon—to which those who are jaded with the noise of “ dusky lane and wrangling mart ” may be invited from time to time for rest, for fresh air, and, it may be, for such quiet conference *sub tegmine cedri*, as Bishop Thorold described in his primary charge, and as is fresh in the memory of many to whom I speak

to-day. But growing experience confirms me in the opinion that weightier still are the arguments which show the bishop's proper place to be at the central hub of our great wheel, accessible to clergy and laity at the smallest possible cost of time and money whenever need requires.'

In the then deaneries of Lambeth, Southwark and Newington there was a population of 424,234, with fifty-one parishes and one hundred and thirty-seven resident Church of England priests. In the district there were also thirty-two Nonconformist chapels, but only thirteen of the ministers were resident, some of them living as far away as Hampstead. The bishop continued :

'Nonconformist ministers, free from what may be called territorial responsibility, may rightly reside where they will. They are bound to consider how their special work can best be done, and the Sunday sermon will probably gain in power and usefulness if it can be prepared in a quiet home during a comparatively undistracted week. The task assigned to the parish priest of the National Church is of a different and wider sort, and, when he too considers humbly how his work may best be done, he will thank God that his home, and the home of his family, is of necessity in the midst of those to whose

manifold needs in weal and woe he is set apart to minister.'

The Nonconformist is a preacher. The parish priest, entrusted with a cure of souls, must be in the fullest sense the shepherd of his flock. It is a great claim and an excellent ideal. But the Archbishop has never been ready to admit that, as the Nonconformist preacher is not burdened with the priest's responsibilities, he cannot claim his privileges.

The enthronement in Rochester Cathedral was followed by a great meeting at St. Saviour's, Southwark, where Dr. Davidson referred to the social problems which were so widely discussed in the early 'nineties, and which the Church had been forced to recognise by Dr. Gore, Canon Scott Holland, Mr. Stewart Headlam and other Christian Socialists. The courtier prelate was eminently sympathetic. It would have been hard for him not to be, speaking in the heart of the dismal slums of Southwark. But, as has always been his habit, he was very cautious.

'The very last thing surely that most of us are at present fit to do,' he said, 'is to plunge headlong into the maelstrom of social and economic strife, and to expect to emerge with advantage either to the eager and angry disputants, or to the

larger cause we have at heart. But at least we are bound to try to understand the main principles which are at work, to trace their origin, to forecast their issue in the light of the Gospel of peace, whereof we are the Divinely accredited ambassadors.'

After the general election of 1892, the bishop grew bolder and more definite: 'The social problem, as we vaguely call it—the problem of the unequal and inadequate distribution of what we call "this world's goods," the wrongs and rights of capital and labour, the education question, the fearful problems of intemperance, of impurity, of the overcrowded and ill-fashioned dwellings of the poor—these, if we Christians are worthy of the name, these are the real Church questions, foremost alike in urgency and magnitude.

'It is the duty of Christians,' he went on, 'to consider carefully what Christ thinks of the present state of things, and to use and apply, with the utmost obedience to Him and trust in Him, what we can discern point by point of His mind. Never so imperatively as now did it devolve on the Church to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest these facts of to-day; to understand, at the very least, what are the thoughts, what are the ideals, which have got such a grip upon the minds of

those whom the Church ought to have enlightened and influenced long ago.'

And once more Dr. Davidson emphasised the responsibility involved in establishment. It will be remembered that Mr. Lloyd George was vociferous in 1892, and that disestablishment was in the air : ' As ministers and officers of a National Church,' the Bishop said, ' we hold a unique position, a monopoly of special opportunity. God grant us grace to use it. Among the foremost evils of disestablishment would be the apparent withdrawal of a responsibility which was never, I believe, in the history of England so faithfully discharged as now, and a sense of which is daily deepening among English Churchmen.'

Very early in his episcopate, Dr. Davidson pleaded for the open church : ' Almost every life, even in our busiest streets, has some minutes at least in the week when the tension is relaxed, and an opportunity for quiet is given, did the tired men and women but know how and where to use it. The churches of South London stand, for the most part, in busy thoroughfares. Is it an exaggeration to say (I trust it is) that they stand, for the most part, closed, and that, save at the stated hours of public service, they have stood thus closed for years? The passers-by have learned to

take it as a matter of course. They feel no want. They would be even surprised to see an open door. Open the doors even all day long, and few or none, we shall be told, would enter. Very likely. But why? Simply because they have learned all their lives to do without that help.

‘Perhaps at first, from its very strangeness, it would be no help to them at all. But we dare not feel that we have absolutely done our best until the young generation grow up accustomed to take the open door as much for granted as their parents and grandparents have taken the locks and bars, and perhaps in years to come we shall marvel how we got on at all in those strange, cold times, when so many churches stood shut all day long. An open door—not some postern that can be found at last by an adventurous and persevering devotee—but a door upon the highway with an obvious welcome, albeit years might pass before the welcome is understood and used. Not in a day, or in a year, do men unlearn the bad habits or the neglect of centuries. The difficulties are obvious and real—not the less real because they are prosaic. It is ours to overcome them in the name of the Lord.’

In 1892 a Liberal Government was returned to power with a small majority, and with Welsh

disestablishment as one of the planks in its platform. Though he had disestablished the Church of Ireland, Gladstone had no stomach for disestablishing the Church of Wales. As the late E. T. Raymond has said :

‘ In Ireland the Church was very low, and Mr. Gladstone deemed it spiritually dead. In Wales he perceived both life and grace abounding. It is probable also that Mr. Gladstone was less sympathetic to the Welsh Dissenters than to the Irish Roman Catholics ; the latter were of course gravely in error, but they did not offend his taste ; his taste and his theological bias were both ranged against the Welsh demand. Finally, he was very old, and Welsh disestablishment as getting in the way of Home Rule was quite simply a nuisance.’

But Gladstone soon gave way to Lord Rosebery, ‘ a peer and owner of racehorses, a Laodicean, and perhaps worse,’ and Mr. Lloyd George, with his Welsh backing, was able to obtain a definite pledge that a Disestablishment Bill should be forced through the Commons.

The Bill was, of course, resisted by the whole power of the Church, the Bishop of Rochester, with his brethren, urging that the proposal to hamper the Church’s activities and to deprive it of some of its rights and privileges should cause all

good Churchmen to forget mere political allegiance, and to stand together in defence of the rights of the spirituality.

During this year, 1892, the bishop found occasion to demonstrate the broad-mindedness—sometimes, as his critics consider, carried to excess—which has characterised his whole career. I recall Professor George Saintsbury's definition of broad-mindedness as 'the result of flattening high-mindedness out.' When the great Baptist preacher, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, died—his Metropolitan Tabernacle was in Newington, quite close to the bishop's house—the bishop wrote to Mr. Spurgeon's brother: 'I am anxious to have some opportunity, if it may be, of sharing the general expression of respect and regard for one who has worked so long and so manfully in his Master's cause, and thus of bearing witness to the substantial unity in Christ which underlies our differences.' But, while being anxious to express sympathy and emphasise agreement, the bishop did not forget the limitation imposed on him by the fact that he was a prince of the Catholic Church. 'I fear,' he added, 'that it would not be possible for me, holding the position I do, to be at the public memorial service in the Metropolitan Tabernacle.' I believe I am right in adding that the Archbishop has never preached

from a Nonconformist pulpit in England or a Presbyterian pulpit in Scotland.

At the meeting of the Upper House of Convocation in February, the Bishop of Rochester made a very characteristic speech on a resolution proposed by the Bishop of Ely deprecating the new custom of volunteer regiments going into camp at Easter, with the result that the religious significance of the most sacred days in the Christian calendar was disregarded. Dr. Davidson was most anxious lest the bishops should not seem to recognise that these Easter reviews had a great national value. Their lordships should, indeed, welcome a 'healthful form of national life,' and the clergy should regard it as a duty to make provision for religious services for the volunteers. 'In other lands,' said the bishop, 'great efforts are made by the clergy of the National Church on corresponding occasions, and during the movements of troops in France and Italy, for instance, arrangements are made for early Masses for those who are engaged in the reviews, and every effort made to provide religious ministrations for men who are for the time removed from their homes. If their clergy would do that, they would abate the difficulty now felt, and, moreover, it would be a great advantage to men who did not take advantage of religious

ministrations at home, though they might do so on other occasions if the opportunity were put before them.'

The Bishop of Rochester was no Sabbatarian. The push-bicycle was at the height of its popularity thirty years ago, and the bishop saw no reason why the bicycle should not be used on a Sunday. 'Bicycles,' he said, in this same speech, 'constituted precisely the form of amusement used by men who were busy all the week and who had their only chance of fresh air and recreation on Sunday.' It was for the clergy to provide appropriate services for bicyclists, as it was for them to provide for the needs of the volunteers at Easter.

The same enlightened and eminently Catholic view of the proper way to use Sunday was shown by the bishop when he presented a petition to Convocation in favour of the opening of public libraries, museums and art galleries on the first day of the week. He said that the petition came from a body which had among its supporters a very large number of hard-working parish clergy who had a special right to be heard in that House. For some years he had taken an active interest in this question in a different capacity from that of a member of Convocation. He had been for the last eight years a trustee of the British Museum,

where the question had repeatedly come forward. Memorials and counter-memorials on either side had been published again and again, and yet the voices of those who were mainly concerned had never been properly heard. He was perfectly ready to be convinced, upon sufficient evidence, that the dangers and disadvantages attending such Sunday opening, as these petitioners desired, outweighed the advantages. But he must in honesty say that, so far as he could at present judge, the arguments were the other way. It would, of course, be a mere waste of time to enlarge to their lordships upon the obvious *prima facie* good of giving men access upon Sundays to libraries, to the glories of sacred art, to the monuments of antiquity, or to the wonders of natural history. The gain was obvious. So, perhaps, were the objections.

Looking back to the discussions which had taken place both in Parliament and outside, they found that the objections popularly made to the opening of those doors on Sundays fell invariably into three groups. Firstly, 'the working classes do not really want it'; secondly, 'it would involve an immense increase of Sunday labour'; and thirdly, 'it is only the thin end of a wedge, and we should soon have in England what is popularly

known as a Continental Sunday.' Whom did they mean by the working classes? At the Trade Union Congress, at certain working men's clubs and elsewhere, there had been divisions taken on that question, and, though the results and significance of those divisions were loudly challenged, it seemed that what was known as the working man vote had at present decidedly been cast against the opening of our galleries.

But was there not a fundamental mistake in regarding the classes thus represented as the people whom the question principally concerned? What of the classes educationally a grade—or several grades—above that to which reference was usually made? What of shop attendants, small shopkeepers, clerks, young women in business—even the smaller professional men? Had their voice ever been heard upon this subject? It was indisputable that this class, more than any other in the community, was unorganised, inarticulate and therefore practically silent. He believed that, if they could speak together, it would be found that many would rejoice in the opportunity of such a mode of spending a part of their sorely-needed Sunday rest. At all events, the problem was not solved by saying that the Trade Union Congress had voted against Sunday

opening. As to the increase of Sunday labour, there would and must be some increase of labour, and it was both fair and right to emphasise that disadvantage. But the amount of increase was commonly very much exaggerated. People seemed to suppose that if, say, the galleries of the British Museum or the Natural History Museum were open upon Sunday, a great host of assistants and attendants would be at work there on Sunday, as they were on other days. Not a bit of it. A few extra policemen, besides those who, of course, were always guarding our public buildings and collections, Sunday and week-days alike, would perambulate the galleries to see that no mischief was done.

The last point was probably the most important of all. Would such opening of our national institutions be simply the thin edge of a wedge which would be driven home until the priceless blessing of our English Sunday had disappeared? After turning the matter over for years, from every point of view, he could not bring himself to think that such a fear was justified. What was needed was a clear line of demarcation. At present there was no clear line at all. Some of our national and municipal institutions were open, and some were not. But a perfectly clear line could be

drawn, and he would like to see it drawn, with absolute rigidity. Wherever any institution or gallery or museum or exhibition was open for money profit, there should be applied to it the provision of existing laws. The subject was an intensely difficult one, and he had left great tracts of the question, both religious and social, untouched. One was likely to be misunderstood and misrepresented by good men, even if one admitted that there were two sides to such a question. He earnestly trusted he had not said a word which could lead anyone to think less sacredly of the Divine gift of the day of rest and worship, and of the solemn duty of guarding it.

In this same crowded year, attention was drawn in the newspapers to the scandal of clergymen guilty of serious misconduct who, owing to the Parsons' Freehold, could not be removed from their livings, and pressure was brought to bear on the bishops to introduce a Clergy Discipline Act, which was described in the *Church Times* as 'fundamentally tainted with Erastianism,' since it handed over the offending cleric to a lay tribunal. Before taking any action, Benson, as was his wont, consulted Dr. Davidson.

But Dr. Davidson has never consented to be rushed. In November 1892 the bishop was

petitioned by certain aggrieved and ultra-Protestant parishioners of St. Catherine's, Hatcham, to admonish the vicar and order him to cease his alleged papist practices. The bishop replied with admirable humour. He had noticed that the first name on the Committee was 'that of a gentleman who was at present churchwarden of another parish, and therefore can scarcely claim to be entitled to a voice in such questions as the hours of Divine service or the hymn-books in use in St. Catherine's Church, which he presumably would not at present under any circumstances attend.' It is curious in these days to read that the bishop was asked to order the vicar to discontinue the use of the *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, and to order him to celebrate Holy Communion in the evening. The bishop took leave to suppose that the opinions of his petitioners were not those of a majority of the parishioners. He did not forget that they had canvassed the parish, and obtained a large number of signatures to a protest 'against corrupt teaching and practice.' But he added—and one can almost hear the Dr. Davidson of thirty years later speaking—'Before I can rightly estimate the value of the signatures thus obtained, I shall require to know in what way and by whom the issue was placed before the

parishioners, and how far the precise points in dispute were really understood by them.' Could anything be astuter?

The bishop's own attitude to Ritualism and the moanings of the extreme Protestants was explained at great length in a speech delivered in 1894, and which is important enough to quote at some length. He said :

' If Dean Stanley meant to convey that Tractarianism was merely modern æsthetic taste with an ecclesiastical hue, he would be sufficiently refuted by the life of such a man as Dr. Pusey, whose interest in the æsthetic side of modern ritual was exceedingly small. On the other hand, to ascribe to the influence of the Oxford Church Revival, by itself, the extraordinary change which our generation has seen, either in beauty of fabrics or in the mode of Divine service, would be to contradict the evidence which is furnished every day, say, in Presbyterian Scotland or in English Nonconformity, or even in the architecture of a modern town hall. Nor is this an academic question only. The thought, if we can express it aright, enables us to draw a true distinction between observances which have, and are meant to have, a direct doctrinal significance and observances which are simply the outward expressions of the

same spirit of reverence and pure taste which is telling in modern life in a hundred other ways. To most of us, perhaps, the distinction is obvious, but it has certainly been ignored to a remarkable degree in the controversies which have been known as Ritualistic.

‘ If anyone will take the trouble to examine the complaints which have been made by the average parishioner to his bishop, from the days, say, of Bishop Blomfield to our own, he will find that the acts, which have mainly given rise to difficulty, have been, in the proportion of at least three to one, acts with no doctrinal significance whatever, except the general desire for a reverent service, a desire which scarcely anyone would disclaim. The acts may have been right or wrong, wise or unwise, but at least they were not dependent upon specific doctrines. Cassocks, surpliced choirs, processional hymns, banners, chanted psalms, intoned litanies—these, and other acts like these, were the main causes of disturbance, and even riot, thirty years ago. The average citizen disliked them ; he called them popish, and in his denunciations he mixed them indiscriminately with other usages which, unlike these, were meant by their promoters to have a distinct doctrinal significance.

‘ We have by degrees learned better, and there

are now hundreds of churches in which the doctrine taught is as Protestant as ever, in the right sense of that tortured word, but in which the outward form of service would have been denounced as popish by the parents of the contented worshippers who occupy their seats to-day. English Non-conformity and Scottish Presbyterianism, if we observe their modern usages, will give a precisely parallel example, but upon that I need not dwell. What I desire to press is this—that the distinction, already clear with regard to certain usages, may properly be carried further still. It is, I suppose, inevitable that, in a generation whose canons of taste have changed so rapidly, a certain jar must be given to the feelings of the older and more conservative worshippers by any movement which is appropriately to express what is desired and felt by younger men. But I would ask anyone who still continues to be conscientiously pained by what he regards as the undesirable Ritualism of his parish church to sit down quietly and endeavour to state in detail to himself what is the erroneous doctrine which he believes is being inculcated by the usages to which he takes exception. I think he would be surprised to find, in the case of a large number of usages, how difficult is the task ; and if the points at issue, or most of

them, can be reduced to questions rather of taste than of doctrine, he will probably be disinclined to exalt his personal opinions and inclinations to the dignity of fundamental principles.'

This is, of course, the general attitude of the latitudinarian. So long as ritual has no doctrinal significance, then it is permissible. It adds to the attraction of the church. It tickles the æsthetic sense of the people. But immediately ritual is the outward and visible expression of fundamental belief, then it is suspect. 'Do what you like as long as what you do has no meaning,' has been the repeated advice of at least three generations of the bishops of the English Church.

Anthony Thorold, Bishop of Winchester, who had been Davidson's predecessor at Rochester, died in July 1895, and Lord Salisbury, again Prime Minister, offered the Bishop of Rochester translation to Winchester. The suggestion must have been in every way welcome. Dr. Davidson had worked hard in Rochester, but he had never been well. In the last months of his episcopacy, he had contrived to visit over three hundred parishes, but this effort had worn him out. The task was, indeed, too great for his strength. His cure of

souls consisted of two million people, and his diocese was growing at the rate of thirty-five thousand a year, and when Winchester was offered to him there could have been no hesitation concerning acceptance. Winchester in 1895 was a far larger diocese than it is to-day, but the Bishop of Winchester lived in state and comfort in Farnham Castle, and the Bishop of Rochester in straitened quarters in the Kennington Road. Moreover, the Bishop of Winchester has precedence after the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London, and traditionally stands in the Archiepiscopal succession, while to Dr. Davidson there must also have been attraction in the fact that he is the Prelate of the Order of the Garter, a fact which would strengthen his many connections with the Court.

Dr. Davidson was on his way to Scotland when Winchester was offered to him. He telegraphed to the Archbishop, who wrote in his diary :

‘ He saw his doctor on the way here, who strongly counselled him to accept it when offered, though he thought the work at Rochester too severe. The immense number of evening Confirmations, and the ceaseless worry

about raising money for his poor diocese, are the points which Barlow fears for him.

‘Rochester, having reached Durham on his way to Scotland, telegraphed and came straight back to Addington to consult me. But there is nothing to consult about. Nothing to consider further than by the single prayer to be kept back if it were wrong, for to all human sight it is most right.’

The following letter was addressed by the bishop to the Rochester archdeacons :

‘Bishop’s House, Kennington, S.E.,

‘*7th August, 1895.*

‘MY DEAR ARCHDEACON,—Before you receive this letter you will probably have heard of my nomination to the see of Winchester, and I am anxious to explain to you, and to others through you, why it is that I have, after such thought, enquiry and consultation as were possible, felt it right to accept that great position. The traditions and circumstances which invest the see of Winchester with a peculiar importance, and involve for its holder a proportional access of high responsibility, have, of course, been present both to my own mind and to the mind

of the few friends whom I have felt at liberty to consult ; but, if I know myself, I can say unhesitatingly that no such considerations would, of themselves, lead me at present to exchange for any post on earth the work-field to which I was consecrated little more than four years ago. Every month that passes deepens the interest and the hopefulness of the work to which our hands have been set in this unique diocese. But there are practical considerations of another sort, which cannot be lightly set aside. Among the gifts required for the due discharge of our town work is physical strength of a peculiar sort. To name one point only out of several, the demand upon the bishop for evening work in this poorest region of London increases steadily, and, as I think, most rightly. In no other way can our multiplying Confirmations take their proper place in the life of each parish ; at no other hours can gatherings, great and small, of working men and women be appropriately held. But my recent illness has proved that from such evening duty I must, for some time to come, be largely debarred. In other ways, too, it has become clear to those by whose advice I am necessarily guided that the conditions of episcopal work in South London, if that

work be adequately performed, are such as involve a real risk of a return of the incapacitating illness which has already caused so much inconvenience to the diocese.

‘ On the other hand, I am led with confidence to believe that in the somewhat different conditions of work which belong to such a diocese as Winchester I may reasonably hope to be able—so far as physical strength is concerned—to discharge to the full the duties, both diocesan and general, belonging to the bishop of that great see. I have the deliberate assurance of my medical adviser, before whom the facts have been carefully laid, that the anxiety with which he would regard my return to full work in the diocese of Rochester does not apply to the work, equally absorbing and important, but different in character, which is required of a Bishop of Winchester. In these circumstances my right course has seemed no longer doubtful. My Rochester years have been perhaps the happiest—they have been, when strength allowed, the busiest—of my life. I shall, please God, have other opportunities of considering with you the lessons we have together tried to learn, and the work we have together tried to do, for the cause

of our Divine Lord. I know I shall have the help of your prayers when I enter upon the enlarged responsibilities which lie before me in one of the foremost, most onerous and most anxious offices in the Church of England.

‘I am, most truly yours,

‘RANDALL T. ROFFEN.’

CHAPTER IV

BISHOP OF WINCHESTER

RANDALL DAVIDSON had come to be regarded as a chronic invalid, and, when his appointment to Winchester was announced, the *Church Times* commented: 'Many Churchmen will regard with anxiety, not to say misgiving, an experiment which exposes Winchester to the risk of another invalid bishop.' No man would have believed in 1895 that the bishop would be hale and hearty in 1928, after years of heavy responsibility and insistent anxiety. The election of Dr. Davidson to Winchester was confirmed in September, and he was enthroned in his cathedral on 15th October with due pomp and ceremony, though the *Church Times* sadly recorded that 'of banners, incense and vestments there was not a trace.'

Archbishop Benson died in 1896, and the intimacy between the primate and his suffragan continued to the end. Letters were addressed first to 'my dearest Dean,' then to 'Dearest Roffen,' and then to 'Dearest Winton,' but their tone

remained the same. In one of the Archbishop's last letters, Dr. Davidson was thanked for 'most serviceable suggestions for replies on knotty points,' yet another instance of his influence during the Benson primacy. The Archbishop discussed with Dr. Davidson the propriety of sending a bishop to Russia to represent the English Church at the coronation of the Czar Nicholas II. As I have already suggested, Dr. Davidson inherited from Benson his zeal for an *entente* with the Greek Orthodox Church, and in his letter Benson points out that friendship would certainly be stimulated by the presence of an English ecclesiastic at the Russian coronation. He feared that the Liberals might be critical if the Church appeared to smile on a despot, and that the Protestants might shiveringly believe 'that the road to Rome lies through an idolatrous Greek Church.' Benson regarded both criticisms as merely stupid. The last paragraph of his letter is interesting as indicating the episcopal mind at the end of last century. 'The bishop,' he wrote, 'ought to go in the smartest clothes the law allows. No possible person could object to a cope, and the late Lord Selborne maintained that mitres *might*, and probably *ought* to, be worn by English bishops at their functions. This I think would be right.' It is a

small point of ecclesiastical history difficult definitely to settle, but it appears that Dr. King of Lincoln was the first English bishop since the eighteenth century to wear a mitre, and it is certainly interesting to know that he had Lord Selborne's approval. Nowadays, certainly half, and perhaps more than half of the English episcopate regularly wear mitres, some of the more Protestant of them with great zeal. Dr. Davidson, himself, has never worn a mitre.

Farnham Castle, with its three hundred acres of park, its herds of deer, its beauty and its long history, was a fitting palace for a prince of the Church, though within quite recent times Dr. Davidson's successor has willingly abandoned its costly luxury, and for a sick and tired man it must have been a pleasant dwelling-place. The bishop's new diocese included the Isle of Wight, where Queen Victoria spent so much of her later life. His intimacy with the sovereign increased rather than decreased in her extreme old age. At all times of special trouble or anxiety it was to the Bishop of Winchester that the royal lady turned. When, for example, Prince Henry of Battenberg, the husband of Princess Beatrice and the father of the present Queen

of Spain, died in 1896, the Queen at once sent for her favourite prelate, and Benson wrote: 'It was natural the Queen should want you.'

Dr. Davidson's first year at Winchester was marked by an incident that he must have often recalled with regret. For ten years Robert Dolling, one of the glories of the English Church, had laboured at St. Agatha's, the Winchester College mission in the slums of Portsmouth. 'He lived in obscurity,' said Fr. Stanton, 'caring nothing for money or position, never resting, labouring in the slums in complete unworldliness and intense sympathy.' And a Nonconformist paper wrote of him after his death: 'The name "Father" was not assumed by him, but was the spontaneous tribute of the poor, that recognised in him the paternal qualities of protection for the weak and sympathy for the poor.' And in 1895 this priest, almost unique in his generation, was forced by his bishop to leave Portsmouth because, as *Truth* said, 'he refused to toe the line of official orthodoxy.' Father Dolling was what is called, in ecclesiastical jargon, 'a Prayer Book Catholic,' though he said Masses for the dead and taught his people to make confessions, a teaching as necessary in the Portsmouth slums as in Mayfair itself.

Like most parish priests intent on their jobs, Dolling was inevitably a source of anxiety to his bishop. The Protestant societies, in the almost venomous zeal of the 'nineties, were continually invading his neighbourhood and denouncing his 'Romanising.' 'If we had a clergyman like Mr. Dolling in our neighbourhood,' said a speaker from London at one of these meetings, 'we would take him by the back of the neck and kick him out of the parish.' And a voice from the gallery shouted, 'He weighs fifteen stone, and you might find it difficult.' Father Dolling's body was as large as his soul.

Six years before Dr. Davidson was appointed to Winchester, Bishop Harold Browne suggested to Dolling that 'Stations of the Cross, acolytes in crimson cassocks, incensing at the *Magnificat*, and the like, certainly excited bitter animosity in an eminently Protestant town like Portsmouth.' But the bishop agreed that he had received no complaints from the St. Agatha district. With Bishop Thorold, who succeeded Bishop Harold Browne, Dolling was on terms of affection and mutual understanding, though Thorold was a definite Evangelical. 'I had breakfast with Dolling and his curates,' wrote the Bishop in his diary, 'and the miscellaneous residents, some of them just

out of prison.' The bishop refused to throw the good priest to the lions. 'In my opinion,' he said, 'the substantial good he is enabled to effect by his self-denying and Christian activities far outweighs by its usefulness any distress that may be caused to those who are gravely alarmed by doctrines and practices, which they consider to be quite inconsistent with the standards of the Reformed Church.'

Bishop Thorold died, and Bishop Randall Davidson reigned in his place. Money had been raised for the building of a new and larger church, and Dolling in due course applied to the bishop for the licence which was necessary in order that a parish might be created. Before issuing the licence, the bishop instructed the rural dean to visit the church. The rural dean reported that it was proposed to place a third altar in the side aisle, and that the altar is 'avowedly to be used for Masses for the Dead,' and the bishop declared that he was unable to send a licence 'virtually sanctioning such an arrangement as this.' He added characteristically: 'You are aware from my former letters how cordially I appreciate and value your vigorous work at Landport, and how anxious I am to promote and help it in every legitimate way. I am most anxious not to make

a fuss about trifles, and I desire to recognise to the full the due elasticity and variety desirable in the services of the Church, especially in such neighbourhoods as yours. You will never find me inclined to be needlessly rigid about comparative trifles, but a bishop's responsibility is so grave that when large questions arise he must of necessity act with the utmost care.'

There were various interviews and many letters, which concluded with a long communication from the bishop definitely refusing permission to erect the third altar. But Dolling believed—and no one can read Dr. Davidson's letter without agreeing with him—that he was really forbidden to say Masses for the Dead and to have Celebrations without communicants. 'The surrender of these two points I find it impossible to make,' wrote Dolling in his autobiography. 'An error has largely arisen that I left because I could not have a third altar in my church. But this is incorrect.' Dolling was ill and overworked. It is quite possible that he did not state his case to the bishop very well. But five thousand of his people petitioned him to stay with them, and, while Dolling admits that Dr. Davidson was 'a man of most delightful manners,' the letters show that he was unsympathetic, standing on the letter

Gd

of the law, fearful of the Harcourts of this world. 'If I were to express my private opinion,' wrote Dolling, 'I should say it would have been much wiser for a bishop just entering his diocese to let St. Agatha's be ruled for a year or two by the decision of his predecessor.' Surely Dr. Davidson must often have regretted that he did not take that course.

Dolling left Portsmouth, leaving sorrowful hearts behind him, to labour for another few years at St. Saviour's, Poplar, and to die in 1902. Dr. Davidson was destined to move from strength to strength, from palace to palace.

Canon Scott Holland supplied the happiest comment on the Dolling case: 'Bishop Davidson's point of danger is not the Court. He has survived its perils with a singular simplicity. Rather it is to be sought at the Athenæum. There dwell the sirens who are apt to beguile and bewitch him. They have ceased to be mermaids with harps, and have adopted the disguise of elderly and excellent gentlemen of reputation, who lead you aside into corners and in impressive whispers inform you what will not do and what the intelligent British public will not stand.'

In the spring of 1896 the Conservative Government introduced an Education Bill which the

Radicals vehemently opposed and the Church, on the whole, approved. The Archbishop again consulted Dr. Davidson. 'Tell me any more you think and hear. There are some dark places.' In the last weeks of his life Benson was concerned with the Lambeth Conference of 1897, the agenda of which was largely the work of the Bishop of Winchester. The Archbishop died in October. Speaking in the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation in January 1897, Dr. Davidson said :

'Never in my life before have I been, and never certainly in my life again can I expect for the same number of years to be, on like terms of intimacy with any earthly friend. And, what is not always the case in the closest intimacies of our lives, each year, each day, on which I was brought into contact with the Archbishop, deepened for me the sense of his personal character and of his peculiar and special characteristics and powers. . . . Already in 1882, when Archbishop Tait died, Bishop Benson was to me a close friend, and then I was allowed to enter upon a relation of intimacy with him as his confidential secretary and chaplain, an intimacy which, in another form, he honoured me by continuing to the close of his life three months ago. It is, I

think, a unique experience, perhaps, to have had the opportunity of observing in succession two men so different as Archbishop Tait and Archbishop Benson, dealing day by day with precisely the same topics, and arriving, one may say, practically at precisely the same results, but by roads and channels which were by no means the same.'

Never, indeed, had an ecclesiastic a more thorough training for the time when to him too should fall the highest of ecclesiastical offices, as Archbishop Davidson had.

From the broadest point of view, by far the most important event of the closing years of Benson's primacy was the passionate effort for which Lord Halifax and the late Abbé Portal were responsible for effecting reunion between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. These efforts, made in the years between 1894 and 1896, have been repeated at Malines, thanks to the same two single-hearted enthusiasts. The conversations at Malines took place with the knowledge and approval of Dr. Davidson, and he was certainly privy to all that happened thirty years before, and most certainly at that time he approved Benson's action.

Benson, it should be repeated, High Churchman

though he may have been, was fiercely anti-Roman. His son says that from boyhood he had 'a deep antagonism both to the errors of doctrine and the arrogant claims of Rome,' and in later life 'he sometimes exclaimed with a hushed vehemence that he could almost believe that Rome was Anti-Christ.' There is more than a suggestion in his biography that this gentle man was not a little jealous of the great place that Cardinal Manning held in the public eye, and he permitted himself to go so far as to declare that 'Church of England people ought not to have any kind of alliance with Roman Catholics.' He had, of course, a pious wish for the reunion of Christendom, but no belief that he would ever see it achieved. 'The dream of union,' he wrote to Bishop Davidson, 'is simply inappreciably and infinitely far off.' He was anxious for friendship with the East. He made many amiable references to Nonconformists. But for Rome he had nothing but criticism and dislike.

In 1894 the Abbé Portal, a monk of the Congregation of St. Vincent de Paul, and a theological professor, wrote under a pseudonym a pamphlet in which he concluded that English Orders were invalid, although most of his arguments appeared to suggest the contrary opinion. The Abbé

Duchesne, most famous of modern French theologians, reviewed the pamphlet, and declared for the validity of English Orders, stating that the Roman Church had never condemned Anglican ordinations, and that re-ordination of Anglican priests was merely suggested by prudence. In the summer of 1894, the Abbé Portal came to England and was taken by Lord Halifax to see the Archbishop at Addington, and, on his return to France, the Abbé was summoned to Rome, where he had interviews with Cardinal Rampolla, then the Secretary of State, and with Pope Leo XIII. Cardinal and Pope were both keenly interested in the Abbé's account of what he had seen and heard in England. The Abbé suggested that a sympathetic letter should be addressed by the Sovereign Pontiff to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Pope is reported to have replied: 'How gladly I would say my *Nunc Dimittis* if I could make the smallest beginnings of such a reunion. You know I am eighty-five years old.'

Full of the sympathy shown him in Rome, the Abbé hurried back to England. But Cardinal Vaughan promptly declared in a speech in Lancashire that nothing 'but absolute and unqualified submission could effect reconciliation,' and the

Archbishop was able to point out to the Abbé and Lord Halifax that there was no definite offer, indeed, no definite approach, from the Vatican. Lord Halifax wrote letter after letter arguing and pleading, but the English Archbishop remembered the English Cardinal: 'Let the Pope silence his Rabshakeh, who talks to the men that sit on the wall, if he wishes Hezekiah to listen to a secret messenger of peace.'

In 1895, Lord Halifax was in Rome interviewing the Pope, Cardinal Rampolla, the Abbé Duchesne, Baron Von Hügel, Cardinal Gasparri, Cardinal Gasquet and Cardinal Vaughan, reporting the results of his interviews to the Archbishop, who was staying in Florence. But the Archbishop was bored. 'It is an academic affair,' he commented. The hopes of the Reunionists were considerably damped by the Apostolic letter, *Ad Anglos*, published by the Pope, in which no mention whatever was made of the English Church or of the English bishops. This letter was followed by the appointment of a Commission to investigate Anglican Orders, and, on the invitation of a member of the Commission, Fr. Puller, S.S.J.E., and Canon Lacey went to Rome to supply information. The result of this Roman visit has been told by Canon Lacey in a long and most interesting volume. Whatever

influence Duchesne and Portal may have had in Rome was much more than counter-balanced by the influence of the English Roman Catholic hierarchy, and in September 1896 the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* was issued, in which Anglican Orders were declared entirely null and void. The issue of this Bull was immediately followed by the suppression of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, which had been founded a year before in France by a group of friendly French scholars. The Archbishop at once replied to the Pope with an unequivocal statement. 'Our Holy Orders,' he wrote, 'are identical with those of the whole Catholic Church. They are, in origin, continuity, matter, form, intention and all that belongs to them, identical accordingly with those of the Church of Rome except in the one modern point of subjection to the Pope, on which point at the Reformation we deliberately resumed our ancient concurrence with the whole Catholic world besides.' And that was the end of the matter so far as Archbishop Benson was concerned. But for Lord Halifax and Abbé Portal there remained many more years of zealous effort and prayer that a great good might haply be reached.

The gentle Benson was succeeded by Temple, 'a gnarled old man who, at the time of life when most people are fit only for the chimney-corner,

was still regarded as the strongest prelate on the bench.' Temple was seventy-five. He had been greatly influenced by Tait, who was only ten years his senior, when he was an undergraduate at Balliol. He followed Tait as head-master of Rugby, and, indeed, he owed his appointment to his predecessor's suggestion, and ecclesiastically he stood directly in the Tait succession. It has been suggested that, when he was Bishop of London, Temple was the chief adviser of the Archbishop, who was eight years his junior. That was certainly not the case. Benson often expressed admiration for Temple's great qualities, but no such intimacy existed between the two men as between Benson and Dr. Davidson, and there is no sort of evidence that Temple was consulted from day to day as Davidson was consulted.

As Bishop of London, Temple was one of the assessors in the Lincoln trial, but the addresses that he afterwards delivered to his clergy show that, while accepting the Archbishop's findings, he had no great love for them. He insisted that the Judgment was merely permissive, and that the ritual practices that had been sanctioned had no doctrinal significance. Benson was a High Churchman, but Temple was far more thoroughly a sacramentalist. He cared nothing for externals, but his essential

sacramentalism was expressed in the famous sermon that he preached, when Bishop of Exeter, at the consecration of Truro Cathedral. In his Balliol days Temple was a disciple of the Oxford movement. He reacted to Moderate Liberalism when Newman and W. G. Ward went to Rome, and slowly, and as he grew older, he fought his way back to a modified Tractarianism, and held it to the end. He might, perhaps, be most accurately described as a Liberal High Churchman. And he held very rigid views concerning the nature of the Church and the responsibilities of its ministers. Dr. Temple refused to give his sanction to the Rev. H. R. Haweis to preach in the pulpit of the City Temple, and the agitation that followed led to strongly-worded resolutions being passed in both Houses of the Canterbury Convocation, the Lower House requesting the bishops to suppress the custom of the exchange of pulpits, 'which is a great scandal in the eyes of many devoted Church people, and is detrimental to the spread of true religion.'

Temple's primacy was short. His appointment at his advanced age was an obvious blunder, and his occupancy of the throne of St. Augustine left small impression on the history of the Church. In a sense, his five years at Canterbury mark a break

in Dr. Randall Davidson's great personal influence in the councils of the Church. The two prelates were in effect much farther from each other than Dr. Davidson was from the ritualistic Benson.

The Lambeth Conference, the agenda of which Davidson and Benson had compiled, met in the first months of Temple's primacy, with the Bishop of Winchester as one of the two secretaries. One hundred and ninety-seven bishops attended the Conference, and, in view of the present heated controversy concerning Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, there is particular interest in the following extract from the Encyclical Letter, in which the resolutions of the Conference were summarised: 'Difficulties having arisen in some quarters with regard to the administration of Holy Communion to the sick, we recommend that such difficulties should be left to be dealt with by the bishop of each diocese in accordance with the direction contained in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, Concerning the Services of the Church.' The Encyclical Letter was a colourless document, not unfairly described as a series of 'truisms and platitudes.'

Before the meeting of the Conference, Temple had corrected and signed the reply to the Papal Bull which was being drawn up by a committee

of bishops when Benson died, and which was, in substance, a reaffirmation of the validity of Anglican Orders and a repudiation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

In 1898, Sir William Harcourt, most renowned of modern swashbuckling politicians, was looking round for a fresh occupation. He had spent a long life in political controversy, but he had quarrelled with Lord Rosebery and had resigned the leadership of the Liberal Party in the House of Commons, and for the moment he was unemployed. So, *faute de mieux*, he turned to the Church. Harcourt had taken a leading part twenty-five years before in the debates on the Public Worship Regulation Act, and had joined with Disraeli in ridiculing 'the Mass in masquerade.' It is only fair to add that he was far more in earnest than Disraeli, to whom, as Mr. A. G. Gardiner has well said, 'one form of Christianity was probably as amusing as another, for at heart he was a Jew of the Circumcision.' Harcourt was a complete Erastian. 'My creed in Church and State,' he said, 'is that of an old Whig and that of a thoroughly consistent Protestant.' The National Church was to him a branch of the Civil Service, and the bishops and priests of the Church were servants of the State. The introduction of a

Benefices Bill, which was supposed to favour the Anglo-Catholic party, was the pretext on which Harcourt fastened as a very godsend. He made speeches, he wrote long letters to *The Times*, he attacked the bishops for not carrying out the law, as they were attacked in the House of Commons a few months ago, and he was particularly indignant that the episcopal veto had been exercised and the persecuting zeal of the Protestant societies handicapped. The bishops were indignant at this last charge, and, in a speech in the House of Lords, Dr. Randall Davidson declared that, with three insignificant exceptions, one of them being the case of the reredos in St. Paul's, no living bishop had ever exercised the veto which the law gave him.

Harcourt denounced the Confessional—specifically authorised in the Book of Common Prayer—Reservation of the Sacrament, and the ceremonial use of incense. He said : ‘ This is no question of mere ceremony or ritual ; it goes to the root of the whole sacramental doctrine on which the English Reformation hinges, and which opens the chasm which irrevocably divides the Protestant Church of England from the Church of Rome. It is the outward and visible sign of the *opus operatum* of the sacrificing priest—the most potent engine of

priestcraft—as distinguished from the faithful communion of the congregation, which is the corner-stone of the Protestantism of the English Church.’

With the letters to the Press, Harcourt carried on what Mr. Gardiner calls ‘an enormous correspondence’ with Dr. Randall Davidson and Creighton, Bishop of London. Dr. Davidson to an extent agreed with Harcourt’s point of view, but he had not forgotten the utter failure of the Public Worship Regulation Act. He had seen for himself the futility of persecution, while in his years as bishop he had learned to regard uniformity as a doubtful good, and to realise that the Catholic tradition was part of the heritage of the Church of England.

Harcourt’s raging, tearing propaganda had no immediate effect, but it was unquestionably largely due to Harcourt’s charges that the Ecclesiastical Discipline Commission of 1904 was appointed. One outcome of this Commission was the issue of Letters of Business to the Convocations bidding them prepare a revised Prayer Book. The Prayer Book Measures, therefore, of 1927 and 1928, rejected by the House of Commons on the ground that they prejudiced what the majority in that House regards as the Protestant character

of the Church of England, were ultimately due, not to Catholic intrigue, but to an earlier outburst of Protestant effervescence. There is, indeed, considerable justification for Prebendary Mackay's assertion that Sir William Harcourt is the real author of the revised Prayer Book—a remarkable post-mortem achievement.

In 1899, the bishops petitioned the two Archbishops formally to pronounce whether or not the ceremonial use of incense and processional lights was lawful within the Church of England. A long judgment was drawn up by Temple, to which Archbishop Maclagan of York subscribed. It stated : ' We are obliged to come to the conclusion that the use of incense in the public worship, and as part of that worship, is not at present enjoined nor permitted by the law of the Church of England.' Processional lights were condemned on ' precisely the same line of reasoning.' But the Archbishops were careful to add that ' the liturgical use of incense is not by law permanently excluded from the Church's ritual. The Crown, with the consent of the Archbishop of Canterbury, could on some great occasion order a great ceremonial in which the use of incense should form part.' The Archbishop apparently conceded that the use of incense was not forbidden by the

Canon Law, and that it could be authorised by consent of the Home Secretary and the Archbishop of Canterbury, who were apparently together a sort of dual Pope of the unfortunate English Church. The Archbishop went into fuller detail in a letter to Dr. Davidson, and it should be noted that while Benson addressed the bishop as 'My dearest Winton,' Temple addressed him as 'My dear Bishop of Winchester.' The Archbishop said: 'A procession with incense is clearly an additional ceremony not ordered in the Book of Common Prayer, and clearly neither enjoined nor permitted as a part of public worship. Every clergyman has promised to use the form in that book prescribed and none other. A procession with incense would be an addition to that form. According to our present law, incense cannot be used in our public worship at all. If it is to be used, it must be so used as not in any way to be a part of public worship.' A deputation representing fourteen thousand lay communicants waited on the Archbishop at Lambeth to protest against the finding, and the result of what is known as the 'Lambeth Hearing' cannot be regarded as anything more than the expression of pious opinion. The number of churches in which incense and portable lights were in use in 1899 has

certainly greatly increased during the past twenty years.

The Archbishops assumed that the worship of the Church was regulated by Act of Parliament and they chose 'to interpret a statute when the business in hand was to expound the sacred law.' Anglo-Catholic opinion of the Lambeth Hearing was expressed by Father Dolling in a speech at a meeting of the English Church Union at St. James's Hall. He said :

'The awful question to be driven home is that, as far as England is concerned, the Sacraments are lost ; and I challenge any clergyman, or any layman, or any bishop, in the whole of England, to say that he can in any sense be satisfied with the methods by which the Sacraments are received in England to-day.

'And if I were asked, Could you point out a parish where more people are brought to the Sacraments than in any other place? It is ten to one it would be one of the very parishes that this present message of the Archbishops is directed against. It was not until at Holborn and down in the London Docks, and then in a hundred other churches, men had been brave enough to face the rebukes of their bishops, that the Sacraments were again popularised by the old Catholic method.

Hd

Therefore what you and I should demand, at whatever cost and at whatever hazard, is that which belongs to every branch of the Church—namely, power to bring home the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the present times and the present needs ; because, as He Himself is for all time and over all persons, so the application of His Gospel and His Sacraments cannot be bound by the methods of three hundred or three hundred and fifty years ago.’

But Harcourt rejoiced at the condemnation of ‘fantastic imitations of Roman ritual whose object is the inculcation of Roman doctrine.’

In an address to his Diocesan Conference, Dr. Davidson explained his own position candidly and in detail. He regretted that the Ecclesiastical Courts had not been reformed, as recommended by the Commission, whose report had been ignored for fifteen years. It has, by the way, remained ignored to this day. The bishop went on to ask how the Church of England differed from the pre-Reformation Church, and he found five points of difference—the repudiation of the papal jurisdiction, the liturgy simplified and in English, the ‘open Bible,’ ‘the restriction of private Confessions to narrow limits and particular occasions,’ and ‘a return to the primitive

view of Holy Communion.' The reference to Confession is interesting, and it would be still more interesting to know the authority for the bishop's statement, and there is some significance in the fact that he made no reference to prayers for the dead. Towards the end of his speech the bishop showed a mild sympathy with the anti-Catholics by deploring the swing back to 'the materialistic doctrines of the fifteenth century.' For 'ritual accretions,' as he called them in a letter to Lord Halifax, Dr. Davidson had no taste and little patience.

The Bishop of Winchester, who, as unbeneficed clergyman, as dean, and as bishop, had been the sovereign's close confidant for twenty years, was with her when her long life at last came to its end. Queen Victoria spent the Christmas of 1900 in Osborne, and was able to attend to the business of the State until the middle of January. On the 18th of January the *Court Circular* published an announcement that, for the first time, warned the nation that the death of the sovereign was imminent. The Bishop of Winchester had crossed to Cowes to officiate at a memorial service for Prince Henry of Battenberg in Whippingham Church. Early on the morning of the 22nd of January, the day of the Queen's death, he was

sent for to Osborne House, and he and the Lord Chamberlain were the only persons, outside her family, who were present when the Queen peacefully and painlessly breathed her last. It was the Bishop of Winchester who said the last prayers by the royal bedside, and it was he who afterwards conducted a short service for the bereaved family.

On the day of the funeral, the Bishop of Winchester again prayed with the family by the coffin before it was carried to the warship for the last journey, first to Portsmouth, then to London, and then to Windsor. With the Archbishop of Canterbury he conducted the service in St. George's Chapel, and, by right of his rank, the bishop and the Dean of Windsor were the clergy in the procession when the coffin was carried from the *chapelle ardente* to the royal mausoleum.

Archbishop Temple was eighty-one, and in obvious failing strength, when he faced the heavy ordeal of the coronation of King Edward in August 1902. Again it was the Bishop of Winchester who stood beside him, holding the large scrolls on which the addresses and injunctions to be said by the Archbishop were printed in very large type, and it was the bishop who went to the Primate's help when he stumbled in making his obeisance to the sovereign.

Immediately after the Queen's death, Dr. Randall Davidson asked the King if he should continue the confidential recommendations which he had made to the late Queen, and the King replied that he wished the old arrangement to go on. But Dr. Davidson's influence was by no means the same. When he suggested that retired Colonial bishops should be given canonries, and that royal chaplains should not be compelled to vacate their positions if they accepted preferment, the King expressed his entire disagreement, bluntly commenting: 'The bishop evidently advocates the system of pluralists, which I do not.' Soon after his accession, King Edward ceased personally to consider ecclesiastical appointments, which were left till the end of his reign absolutely in the hands of the Prime Minister. The King, however, was directly responsible for the appointment of the present Bishop of London, a fact not without interest and significance. Mandell Creighton died a week before the Queen, and Dr. Davidson, as Bishop of Winchester, represented the sovereign at the bishop's funeral. The King desired that Dr. Davidson should be translated from Winchester to London. He wrote to Lord Salisbury: 'I only wish that the Bishop of Winchester [Dr. Randall Davidson] would accept the Bishopric

of London, but he has repeatedly told me that he could not undertake it on account of his health and other reasons. Still, it might be offered to him as you suggest, and, failing him, be offered to the Bishop of Rochester. Should the latter decline, I am inclined to believe that the Bishop of Stepney, Dr. Winnington Ingram, would be a better selection than the Bishop of Newcastle.'

On 4th December, 1902, Temple was in his place in the House of Lords to support the Education Bill introduced by the Conservative Government. He was worn and feeble. He concluded his speech with the assertion, 'The Bill is an honest and statesmanlike measure, and I hope your lordships, in spite of any objections that may be made, will nevertheless pass it into law and let us see how it will act when it begins to work.' Then he sank back into his seat, and was taken home to Lambeth, to die nineteen days afterwards. The Bishop of Winchester and the Bishop of London were in the Archbishop's room when he received Holy Communion for the last time from the Archbishop of York, the three prelates afterwards being blessed by the dying Primate. It was said of Temple after his death that it was a tragedy that 'one so good, so strong, so loyal, should have done so little.'

One thing Temple did during his primacy which was to affect the life of Dr. Davidson. He sold Addington Park, which Archbishop Manners-Sutton had bought as a summer residence, and where Dr. Davidson had stopped so often both with Tait and Benson. With the proceeds of the sale, Temple had the Old Palace at Canterbury rearranged and enlarged for an archiepiscopal residence, properly feeling—as, indeed, Benson had felt—that the Archbishop ought to spend a certain part of the year in the city of his see. ‘I think,’ said Temple, ‘the day has passed when Archbishops of Canterbury should appear as country gentlemen.’ He was an old man, and he was unaffected by the argument that, as the Archbishop had to spend the greater part of the year at Lambeth, he wanted a more bracing country house than the palace in Canterbury Close. When he was asked if he thought that all his successors would wish to live in Canterbury, he made the characteristic reply: ‘No, I don’t. But I want to make ’em.’

CHAPTER V

THE BEGINNING OF THE PRIMACY

TWELVE days after the death of Temple, Dr. Davidson learned from the Prime Minister, the then Mr. Arthur Balfour, that he had submitted his name to the King for the vacant Archbishopric. Dr. Davidson could hardly have been surprised, but he took the proper and the usual course of consulting Dr. Maclagan, the Archbishop of York, who wrote to him :

‘ Your long and intimate acquaintance with Lambeth and its Archbishops, and all the duties belonging to their office, has been a very remarkable and providential preparation for your succeeding them in the Archbishopric. I feel sure also that you have special gifts which will enable you not only to carry on their work, but to add to it some features which will greatly promote the interests of the Church.

‘ Ours has indeed been a long and intimate friendship, and I trust that this change in our

relations may only draw us into even closer fellowship.'

The opinion of the Archbishop of York was the opinion of the country. *The Times*, in a leading article on his appointment, said :

' His fitness to lead the bishops in the House of Lords is beyond question ; and it is almost certain that a *referendum* to the present bishops would result in their choosing Dr. Davidson without a dissentient voice. Since he first took his seat in the House he has gained a high place, perhaps the highest among episcopal statesmen, especially in regard to social movements. He was a member of the Select Committees on Infant Life Protection and the Early Closing of Shops, and is now promoting, with Lord Avebury, a Bill on the latter question. In the matter of temperance, it will be remembered that in 1900 he introduced three measures into the Upper House, the partial results of which are now coming into operation. His recent speeches on the Education Act need not be cited to prove his great zeal in that cause.

' His views on the chief matters of controversy in the English Church are well known. He has taken a consistently moderate position between the Scotch severity of Tait and the more sensuous

Churchmanship of Benson. He understands, as he stated in his charge of 1899, the difference between "superstitious materialistic teaching" and practices coming properly under the head of "deliberate reasonable self-discipline." In regard to ecclesiastical litigation, he has publicly favoured the plan of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission for strengthening the diocesan and provincial tribunals, and for providing an appeal from the provincial court to the Crown. But his actions can speak as definitely as his expressions of opinion. In the well known case of St. Agatha's, Landport, he had the courage, without loss of time, to insist on his admonition being obeyed, even though the result was bound to be the withdrawal from his diocese of Mr. Dolling, whose social activities were almost heroic.

'As Bishop of Winchester he has been frequently consulted about these ritual difficulties by his brethren on the bench, and his moderating influence is not likely to be less now that he is advanced to the Chair of St. Augustine. For the work which awaits him at Lambeth he will require all his physical strength, and it is to be hoped that he will make a speedy recovery from the attack of influenza from which he has been suffering for some days past.'

'The sensuous Churchmanship of Benson' is certainly a strange phrase, and the praise for Dr. Davidson's treatment of Fr. Dolling indicates a curious and perverted view of the mission of the Church. Dr. Davidson may have been prompt and courageous in that case, but he can hardly be said to have acted as a father in God to a harassed priest. But *The Times* certainly expressed the average Erastian Englishman's opinion.

Dr. Davidson was enthroned in Canterbury Cathedral on 12th February. He was, it was said, 'particularly impassive and collected,' showing no sense of nervousness or flurry and seeing to it that his attendant chaplains and train-bearers were always in their proper places. There were comparatively few bishops present, but Lord Rosebery was in the congregation, observing, as the *Church Times* sarcastically commented, 'what little ritual there was.' The *Church Times* described the new Primate as 'a broad Low Churchman,' which I presume is much the same as a Liberal Evangelical, and this view was also expressed by *The Times*, which, in the leading article published on the morning after the enthronement, commended him to the nation as 'a layman's parson.' The leader-writer said :

'Yesterday, amid all that is most impressive

in English architecture and of all that is most stately in English ceremonial, and amid such sunshine as we can hardly boast to be English in the month of February, Dr. Davidson was enthroned in the *cathedra* of St. Augustine. On the previous evening he had been welcomed by the municipality of Canterbury, and had expressed his natural sense of the extreme heartiness of his reception in a speech which shows, what everyone who has watched his career realises quite well, that the Archbishop is a layman's parson, and that he understands how to commend his calling to those who are not of his cloth. . . .

'At a time when, without question, there is a danger of sharp cleavage between clergy and laity, this side of the Archbishop's character and possibilities will not be without its effect.'

Referring to the Archbishop's speech at the banquet of welcome, *The Times* said :

'Dr. Davidson did not omit to acknowledge the cordial and affectionate messages which have come to him from the heads of the Church of Scotland and of the various English Nonconformist Unions. He is too shrewd to build too much on those messages, or to suppose that in this they bring home reunion any nearer. What these Nonconformists know is that, in all the varied

spheres in which he has laboured for the English Church, he has lived in amity with those who represent other creeds and other customs. The battle of working the Education Act has still to be faced, but the carnage made will be less woeful when the forces on one side are to be led by a man who obviously does not go into the fight merely with the object of counting the slain among his foes.'

And the leader went on with a curiously accurate forecast of one side of Dr. Davidson's achievement as Archbishop :

'He has had opportunities that could only come to one who has gone carefully through the correspondence of Archbishop Tait, of estimating the growth of the Anglican union and of the Churches which co-operate with it. The English Churches outside England have their ideas of what is due to them in the way of independence and self-administration. But, when they are assured of their rights, they can give rein to their sentiment, and their sentiment converges on Canterbury as surely as the sentiment of the Roman on St. Peter's. The Archbishop did well to refer to the enterprise of the American Episcopal Church, which came in first with its message of congratulation and was prevented only by

misadventure from sending a bishop across to represent it yesterday. And this sentiment is not a mere idea. It means work for the new Archbishop. It means that every mail will contain its consignment of questions that need answering, of problems that require solving, of advice that must be given. "Greater Britain" is a stern and substantial reality to the man who has to sit in the study of Lambeth Palace. But the Archbishop knows that the English people will still expect him to have his thoughts fixed on the centre of the Empire as well as on its circumference, and that Lambeth is Home Office and Colonial Office in one.'

The Archbishop was at pains to make his position as a middle Churchman perfectly clear. The truth, he said, does not lie either with 'those who look back to the sixteenth century, and, with strange ignorance of history, strive to make out that everything in the Church of England depends upon that,' or with those 'who with equal deficiency of historical knowledge try to make out that what happened in the sixteenth century was a lamentable blunder in Church life.'

Dr. Davidson was the immediate heir of a complex tradition. 'Archbishop Tait,' he said, 'brought the strength of a profound thinker and

clear-headed man of affairs to bear upon the duty, in the name of Christ, of teaching the people of England what National Christianity ought to mean. Then we find his place filled by a man who, with that brilliant versatility, that striking devotion, which found expression in every act, however trifling, taught every man, who cared to know anything about it at all, what that National Christianity ought to mean, as something which came down from the ages long before. Then, lastly, a man whose memory is so fresh with us still that we almost expect to see his stalwart figure as we turn around the corners of these Cathedral walls—he taught us more than any man in that he taught people what righteousness meant in religious life.’

He was returning to a familiar sphere. ‘Twice, at two epochs in my life—twelve years ago, when I was called to the see of Rochester, and seven years ago, when I was called to the see of Winchester—I found myself face to face with this difficulty—as it seemed to me, a grave one—that the work one was entering on was on comparatively strange ground, among strange surroundings, and with faces that were for a time unknown. I find myself to-day in exactly the opposite condition. I have found a difficulty of which I had

not dreamt in facing some of the responsibilities which lie upon me now from the very familiarity of the tasks of the post. Behind the crowded congregation in the choir to-day, behind your figures as I speak to you now, there arise before me the faces of the men—the nearest, the greatest, the wisest, perhaps—that I have known and learned from and loved on earth, whose memories are for me intertwined with these Cathedral walls ; nay, with the very room in which we are met to-day. It so happens that it was in this very room that I performed my first act as chaplain to Archbishop Tait ; and I am speaking the sober truth when I say that the recollection of those other days, the thoughts, which I then had about the office to which I am now called, and the fact of standing to-day in a position which seemed to me then to have about it a character so unapproachable in some respects in its greatness, adds an additional difficulty to difficulties already great enough as one enters on new responsibilities and a larger field of work.'

And the Archbishop concluded : ' All I ask is that I may have the prayers and assistance of all, so that when I am laid to sleep the words may be said that he at least tried to serve his generation, according to the will of God.'

So his primacy began ! From the beginning, Dr. Davidson was concerned with the insistent educational controversy, but with that I propose to deal in a subsequent chapter. Within a fortnight, too, of his enthronement, Catholics and Protestants began to trouble him.

A deputation of a hundred Protestant Members of Parliament waited on the Archbishop at Lambeth, lamenting, in the usual manner, popish practices, and demanding the prosecution of disobedient priests. The Archbishop once more deprecated prosecutions, but with regard to St. Michael's, Shoreditch, and certain other churches, he declared that 'the sands had run out,' and he made the emphatic statement, often quoted against him in these later days : 'I desire and intend that we shall now act, and act sternly.' Then he went on with considerable humour to suggest to the deputation that the ills of the Church were due quite as much to the negligences of the laity as to the extravagances of the clergy, and he pointedly asked them how many of their sons were being prepared for Holy Orders.

Part of 1904 was spent by the Archbishop in a visit to the United States and Canada, where his straightforward statements and his dislike of

10

any sort of fuss made him immensely popular. The impression that he produced was summarised by a Western bishop, who said : ' He is a man of absolute simplicity, with an earnest desire to be as one of us. His visit emphasises the oneness of the two Churches and the two peoples.' On his return he made a rather striking speech defending the Establishment. Disestablishment would be an evil thing for the Church, but it would be the English people who would suffer the most.

In the spring of this year, and as the direct outcome of the Harcourt anti-Catholic agitation, the Balfour Government appointed a Royal Commission ' to enquire into the alleged prevalence of breaches or neglect of the law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England and to the ornaments and fittings of Churches, and to consider the existing powers and procedure applicable to such irregularities, and to make such recommendations as may be deemed requisite for dealing with the aforesaid matters.'

The Commission consisted of fourteen members. Sir Michael Hicks Beach, afterwards Lord St. Aldwyn, was the chairman ; the Church was represented by the Archbishop, the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Gibson, afterwards Bishop of

Gloucester, and Dr. Drury, afterwards Bishop of Ripon; and among the other members were the President of the Divorce Court, that redoubtable Protestant, Sir Edward Clarke, and Sir Lewis Dibdin, still the most emphatic of Erastians. One or two of the members had some tepid Catholic sympathies, but the *personnel* of the Commission made an anti-Catholic report more than probable.

The Commission held 118 sittings and examined 164 witnesses, a large number of them the familiar Protestant informers with fearsome tales to tell of candles on the altar, incense and sacring bells.

The Archbishop himself gave evidence. He began with a detailed and masterly account of the development of ritual in the English Church since the Reformation. He reminded the Commission that the Tractarian leaders were anti-Ritualists. Pusey is the authority for the statement that, until he left the English Church, Newman always consecrated at the north end of the altar. Pusey himself constantly condemned Ritualistic extravagances. Keble never wore vestments, deprecated the practice of non-communicating attendance, and disapproved of any insistence on the rule of fasting reception. 'Two facts seem to me to come out clearly,' said the

Archbishop; 'first, that no definite, or even indefinite, plan or expectation of ritual development formed part of the original Tractarian movement: but, on the other hand, there appears a second fact: that the Tractarian leaders—though those of them who survived into the days of the ritual controversy were, of course, sympathetic with the general line taken by their followers—discouraged rather than stimulated, and even sometimes strongly deprecated, the sort of advance which has given rise to so much controversy.'

The Archbishop then proceeded to a long summary of ecclesiastical history from 1840. It is, of course, not an impartial statement. It could not have been. But it is quite extraordinarily full and candid. Referring to the Ornaments Rubric, as amended by Convocation, the Archbishop said that it was intended that the rule for the Church should be the use of the surplice, and the surplice only. It was suggested to him that the rubric left a clergyman free to wear Eucharistic vestments unless forbidden to do so by the bishop, and Dr. Davidson replied: 'The words may be patient of that interpretation, but I do not think that is the intention.' He reminded the Commission that, in the Purchas

case, the Dean of Arches had declared that Eucharistic vestments, the eastward position, the mixed chalice and the use of wafer bread were all illegal, a decision which, his Grace apparently forgot to remind the Commission, had been almost entirely reversed by the Lincoln Judgment.

Coming to the Public Worship Act, with the early administration of which he had been so much concerned, the Archbishop admitted that the Act had failed because it was 'constantly supposed that there was something in the Act which necessitated or even invited imprisonment as the ultimate penalty.' He denied that this was so, though, of course, he admitted that the imprisonments of the 'eighties had made the Act a discredited futility. Referring to the Lincoln Judgment, the Archbishop made the curious remark that, when the Church Association decided to prosecute Bishop King, they had acted 'rightly and bravely from their point of view.' He took some pains to prove that the High Church objection to the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had grown with the years, and he agreed with the trumpery suggestion of the Chairman of the Commission that 'they [the High Churchmen] began, in fact, to dislike the

Court of Appeal when its decisions began to be unsatisfactory to them.'

The bishops, the Archbishop said, had been, during the whole period of the ritual revival, steadily against prosecutions except as a very last resource. They dreaded prosecutions, because experience had shown that they defeated their own ends. 'Take the case of Mr. Lowder as an example. Had Mr. Lowder, whose popularity in East London at that time was so enormous, been prosecuted, it is at least open to question as historical matter of fairness what the result might have been ; and it is not obvious—it is a legitimate matter for difference of opinion, but it is certainly not quite obvious—that the result would have been to prevent subsequent troubles ; it might conceivably even have been to accentuate them.'

Having concluded his historical survey, his Grace went on to describe to the Committee on what principles he had acted in the governing of the three dioceses with which he had been entrusted. He quoted at length from a Visitation Charge written in 1894. The following is its most salient passage :

'In a similar way we have a right, for the sake of those who come after us as well as for ourselves,

to deprecate with all possible emphasis the fashion of giving a partisan meaning to usages which did not at first have any such significance. The adoption of what is known as the "eastward position," the administration of the mixed chalice, the singing of the anthem "O Lamb of God," and the use of the two lights at the time of Holy Communion, fall naturally into this category. To discuss the causes why these usages, and others with them, were long discontinued in the Church of England would lead me away from my object this afternoon. . . .

' If modes of vesture and music, such as those I first referred to, which were once supposed to give a partisan character to the Churches which adopted them, now do so no longer, but are used without any offence by every school, it may probably come to pass that the same process may take place with regard to the other usages I have alluded to, and with regard also to such customs as that of marking the progress of the Church's year by a change in the colour of ornaments and hangings. I am neither advocating nor deprecating such usages. I cannot bring myself to regard them as in themselves possessing grave importance, although indirectly they are of consequence, inasmuch as they may, or may

not, according to personal temperament and association, promote or retard the devotion of the worshippers, and may possibly be provocative, reasonably or unreasonably, of such strife and ill-feeling as shall more than counter-balance what was meant to be their usefulness.

‘To some few controverted usages, belonging almost exclusively to the Eucharistic service, there is a doctrinal meaning attached. For example, the extreme elaboration of arrangements for cleansing the sacred vessels springs from what was originally intended to convey a specific doctrinal meaning ; and it would not be difficult to find examples of other ways in which the officiating clergy are able, by act and gesture, to do the like. Most of these, however, are matters of degree, about which it would be humiliating or even impossible to lay down precise rules. I content myself to-day with urging upon you, with all the authority which belongs to the office I hold, the solemn duty of unswerving loyalty to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, Catholic and Reformed.’

In 1927 the Archbishop was ready to sanction prayers for the dead. In 1905 he forbade their use. In answer to the question on the subject, he said : ‘ My own line with regard to the question

has been that where there was a distinctive prayer for the dead as such apart from a prayer for the whole Church corresponding with what we have in the Prayer Book, I have directed that the words of that prayer should be so modified as to make it correspond with the concluding part of the Prayer for the Church Militant.'

'And we also bless Thy Holy Name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear; beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy Heavenly Kingdom.' That was all that Dr. Davidson was prepared to sanction twenty-three years ago. A considerable development in ideas and sympathy is obvious when it is remembered that in the Deposited Book there appeared, with the Archbishop's sanction, the prayer: 'Multiply, we beseech Thee, to those who rest in Jesus, the manifold blessings of Thy love, that the good work which Thou didst begin in them may be perfected unto the day of Jesus Christ.' I have been assailed for suggesting that this prayer obviously implies purgatorial progress, but if it does not, it has no meaning.

The Archbishop informed the Commission of the rules that he had laid down in the diocese of Winchester, and which he apparently intended

to enforce in Canterbury. They are a valuable summary of his Churchmanship :

‘ (1) No celebration of Holy Communion ought to take place without at least the minimum number of communicants prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. (2) No reservation of the consecrated elements is permissible. (3) In celebrating the Holy Communion it is not permissible, in ordinary circumstances, to omit the recitation of the Commandments, or to administer the consecrated elements otherwise than with individual recitation of the full prescribed words. If special arrangements are desired, as, for example, when on a great festival the number of communicants is likely to be very large, my sanction ought to be asked beforehand for what is proposed. (4) In order that there may be no question of using, in the office of Holy Communion, any other form than that prescribed, no books or cards containing other prayers or forms ought to be upon the Holy Table, even if the additional prayers be intended solely for the private devotions of the officiant. (5) If it be desired to use wine mingled with water, the mixing ought to be effected elsewhere than at the Holy Table, and not as a ceremony. (6) The “ manual acts ” ought not to be intentionally hidden from

the view of an ordinary communicant. (7) The habitual attendance of children at celebrations of the Holy Communion is undesirable. If children are occasionally permitted to be present with a view to their better understanding of the service, the order of service ought not to be modified in any way, nor ought the children to take any part not ordinarily taken by non-communicants who may be present. (8) The ceremonial use of incense is not permissible. (9) In any official notice of the Holy Communion no other designation of the Holy Sacrament ought to be used than one of the terms to be found in the Book of Common Prayer. (10) No phrase ought to be used in public notices or services which carried the idea of prayer or intercession for the departed further than it is carried in the Book of Common Prayer. (11) The Athanasian Creed ought to be said or sung upon the days appointed. (12) The direction of the Book of Common Prayer ought to be followed with regard to the days for which special services are appointed.'

'What I have tried to do,' Dr. Davidson said in concluding his evidence, 'is to give a specimen or example of the sort of way in which episcopal action is being taken, and to show that it is a mistake to allege, as is sometimes alleged, that the

kind of troublesome and difficult and anxious questions which form a part, though happily only a small part, of the bishops' administrative action and the bishops' responsibilities are being dealt with lightly, or that we forget, as bishops, the gravity of the problems with which we have to deal.'

The Archbishop returned to the witness seat at a subsequent sitting of the Commission, to give some account of the history, the composition and the powers of the Houses of Laymen, which, anticipating the creation of the National Assembly, had been attached to the Convocations. He was asked whether questions of ritual could be dealt with by the Houses of Laymen or by the Representative Church Council, and he made the guarded reply: 'I think they could be dealt with by way of suggestions as to the proper authority for regulating them, as to whether the bishops should have more or less power in ritual matters, or as to whether it was in a large sense expedient that a distinctive dress should, under episcopal sanction, be worn at the Holy Communion. The moment such resolution or recommendation came to be based upon anything which could be interpreted as divine faith or doctrine, it would be out of place, but I should contend that it need not

necessarily be that at all, and it might even expressly say that it did not intend to do so.'

The Commission published a unanimous report in June 1906. It recommended that the interpolation of prayers and ceremonies belonging to the Canon of the Mass, the use of the words 'Behold the Lamb of God' accompanied by the exhibition of a consecrated wafer, Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament under conditions which led to adoration, the Mass of the Presanctified, Corpus Christi processions, Benediction, Celebration of Holy Communion with no communicants except the celebrant, hymns, prayers and devotions involving invocation of, or confession to, the Blessed Virgin Mary or the saints, the observance of the festivals of the Assumption and of the Sacred Heart, and the veneration of images and roods, should be 'promptly made to cease by the exercise of the authority belonging to the bishops and if necessary by proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts.'

Corpus Christi processions and Benediction have been very rare in the English Church, and the veneration of images and roods, I imagine, practically unknown, but the other services and ceremonies that were condemned have continued despite the Royal Commission.

The Commission further recommended that

bishops should have power to refuse to institute an incumbent who would not promise to obey 'the law as to the conduct of Divine Service and as to the ornaments and fittings of churches,' and also to obey such orders as the bishop might give from time to time. They recommended that Ecclesiastical Courts should be constituted on the lines of the report of the Commission of 1883, that recalcitrant incumbents should be ejected from their livings, that the episcopal veto with regard to suits under the Church Discipline Act should be abolished, and that the Public Worship Regulation Act should be repealed. In view of subsequent history, the most important recommendation of the Commission was the following :

'Letters of Business should be issued to the Convocations with instructions (*a*) to consider the preparation of a new rubric regulating the ornaments (that is to say, the vesture) of the ministers of the Church, at the times of their ministrations, with a view to its enactment by Parliament ; and (*b*) to frame, with a view to their enactment by Parliament, such modifications in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and to the ornaments and fittings of churches as may tend to secure the greater elasticity, which a reasonable recognition of the

comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of its present needs seems to demand.'

This was the formal beginning of Prayer Book revision. The recommendation was made in the third year of Dr. Davidson's primacy. The attempt to carry it on has been the insistent business of his reign. The failure to secure agreement between the Church and Parliament has been the tragedy of its last and its twenty-fifth year.

CHAPTER VI

FRANK WESTON, KIKUYU AND DR. HENSLEY HENSON

THE years before the war had, for the Archbishop, their many duties and preoccupations, among them the funeral of one King and the crowning of another. But I pass on to the ominous days that immediately preceded the war, when the Archbishop and the Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference were busy deciding an ecclesiastical cause that had for a year been the occasion of controversy and sarcastic comment, and which, at the end of July 1914, seemed to the outside world of pathetically small account.

It is probable that I have met many saints in the course of my life, without recognising them, for saints have always been found in the most unexpected places and are often only known to the elect. But I have certainly known one man whose right to the high title of saint no man dare deny. He was Frank Weston, Lord Bishop of Zanzibar. His magnificent devotion to the Church had as its complement his absorption in service

to the people among whom he had elected to live, and for whom he worked and died. Frank Weston was one of those rare Englishmen absolutely without race prejudice. For him, black men and white were the children of the same great Father. 'I think,' wrote a native deacon after his death, 'there was no European who knew black people better than he did, their characters and customs, their hardships and their longings. I think there was no European who did more to range himself on the side of the black people, and who was so desirous that they should advance.' Brilliant in his gifts and qualities, ruthless in his self-sacrifice, Weston was both a saint and a great Churchman.

But saints have often been kittle cattle, difficult to manage and perhaps sometimes hard to endure, and the Archbishop must have often lamented the definite faith and the uncompromising acceptance of the Catholic character of the English Church that caused Lambeth to be troubled by Zanzibar.

In 1913, a situation had arisen in Kenya Colony, then called the British Protectorate of East Africa, very similar to that which has caused the present agitation for union in Southern India. Protestant missions overlapped. The native converts could

not understand sectarian differences, and the authorities felt that it was essential to present a united front to Rome on the one hand and to Moslem proselytism on the other. In the two dioceses of Mombasa and Uganda the Church of England was represented by the Church Missionary Society, and the bishops regarded themselves as just Protestants, with all other Protestants as their brothers. A conference of the Protestant missionaries met at Kikuyu, with the Bishop of Mombasa as president and the Bishop of Uganda as secretary, and the delegates were eager to found a native Protestant Church. I quote Canon Maynard Smith :

‘ They agreed on the paramount authority of Holy Scripture, they professed a “ general ” belief in the facts which are summarised in the Apostles and Nicene Creeds, they pledged themselves to administer the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and they arranged that a native ministry should be ordered by the laying on of hands. The said native ministry was to consist of four orders—junior preacher, senior preacher, district preacher, and minister ; and they were all to be trained in one way, whether they were Church of England, Wesleyans, Baptists, or Presbyterians.’

On the last evening of the Conference, the Bishop of Mombasa celebrated Holy Communion in the Presbyterian Chapel, and three months afterwards Weston, who regarded himself as a bishop of the Church Catholic, wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury charging the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda 'with propagating heresy and committing schism.' The document went on :

'And we do hereby most humbly implore Your Grace to obtain from them for publication in East Africa and Zanzibar a complete and categorical recantation of the errors which they have taught in word and action :

'Or, failing that, We do hereby request Your Grace to appoint us a day and place in which, conformably with Catholic precedent, We may appear before You and not less than twelve of Your Grace's comprovincial Bishops sitting with Your Grace as Judges of this cause, and to permit us there and then to meet the aforesaid Lord Bishop of Mombasa and Lord Bishop of Uganda, and in open Assembly to allow us to make and sustain our charges and accusations against them.'

In the winter of 1913-14 the Bishops of Uganda and Zanzibar were both in England, and naturally were both received at Lambeth Palace. The interviews between Weston and the Archbishop

must have been tensely dramatic, the one man eager, impulsive, thinking of the Church as Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, and the other shrewd, cautious, diplomatic, never forgetting that the Church was comprehensive and established. The Archbishop decided that he would not sit as judge to consider Weston's charges, though he added : ' If the trial were one which ought to take place, a precedent for the procedure would have to be created, and I should be ready to take the necessary steps.' The Archbishop referred the whole matter to the Central Consultative Committee set up by the Lambeth Conference. In the interval, Weston wrote letters and pamphlets, and vastly annoyed the great Protestant British public, *Punch* publishing a cartoon by Mr. Raven Hill depicting two native Africans singing a hymn, ' Why do de Christians rage ? ' ' Those who only read Frank's letters to the Press,' says Canon Maynard Smith, ' thought he was a narrow-minded bigot, while those who only knew him upon platforms saw a very gallant gentleman.' The Committee found, on the whole, in favour of the Bishop of Zanzibar. They reported :

' We are not here called upon to consider individual cases. We are confronted by definite proposals, to which two bishops of our Communion

have been parties, for arrangements of a general character between different religious bodies. In these it seems to be implied that members of our Church would be encouraged or even expected to communicate in non-episcopal churches. We are bound to say that we cannot regard any such arrangements as consistent with the principles of the Church of England.'

On the whole, the Archbishop agreed with the Committee. 'I believe,' he wrote, 'that we shall act rightly, and the wisest and strongest missionaries believe that we shall act rightly, in abstaining at present from such services as the closing service at Kikuyu.' But he gave it as his emphatic opinion that in certain circumstances the unconfirmed might be admitted to Holy Communion. He says nothing of the unbaptised, whom some 'broad' Churchmen would also admit. The Archbishop wrote :

'In contradistinction to the system in vogue in many Roman Catholic countries, the Prayer Book of the Church of England specifically lays it down, in the final rubric appended to the Confirmation Service, that in all ordinary cases admission to Holy Communion shall follow and not precede Confirmation. But the rule is one which must be open, as the very wording of the

rubric shows, to exceptions, and the character and range of the exceptions may rightly be subject to episcopal discretion. No careful student of our Church's history will maintain that the rule, or direction, which dates back to a Provincial Constitution of Archbishop Peckham in the thirteenth century, has been consistently or rigidly observed during the last six hundred years. Its original purpose seems to have been to stay, by what was virtually a sentence of excommunication upon the disobedient, the then prevalent neglect of Confirmation, and, from the nature of the case, it had at that time no bearing upon others than the Church's children. The rubric in question, as has been usefully pointed out, "is the last of a series of rules laid down for the guidance of Church-people with regard to their children. First, baptism is not to be deferred ; then the children are to be instructed in the faith, etc. ; then they are to be brought to the bishop to be confirmed ; finally, until they have been confirmed, they are not to be communicants. Those rules must be taken together. They bind, or ought to bind, the conscience of the parent, and, so far as their execution depends on the action of the clergyman, his observance of them is part of his professional duty, legally enforceable."

‘ In view of what passed in the Savoy Conference of 1661, it is difficult to say that the discussions in the Conference were then regarded as having no bearing upon the admission of those who were not ordinarily Conformists. But, even at that date, the question of the admission of such persons to Communion arose very much less frequently than it does to-day. Looking carefully at present-day facts and conditions, I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion a diocesan bishop acts rightly in sanctioning, when circumstances seem to call for it, the admission to Holy Communion of a devout Christian man to whom the ministrations of his own Church are for the time inaccessible, and who, as a baptised person, desires to avail himself of the opportunity of communicating at one of our altars.’

Weston went back to Africa bewildered by the diplomatic findings, and in the preoccupations of the war Kikuyu was forgotten at Lambeth as elsewhere in England.

In 1918, the Bishop of Zanzibar, with all the Orthodox, both Protestant and Catholic, was vastly disturbed by the nomination of Dr. Hensley Henson, then the Dean of Durham, to the vacant bishopric of Hereford. To Frank Weston, Dr. Henson was the arch-heretic. He was accused

of having denied in his public writings the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and of the Resurrection of our Lord, and the Dean and Chapter of Hereford were urged not to elect, and the Archbishop was urged not to consecrate, the nominee of the Crown. The protest mainly came from the Anglo-Catholics, but they had as allies such a definite Protestant as Dr. Wace, the late Dean of Canterbury. Several diocesan bishops publicly declared that they would take no part in the consecration, and a weighty protest was sent to the Archbishop by Dr. Gore, at that time Bishop of Oxford. Before consenting to consecrate Dr. Henson, the Archbishop wrote to him a letter in which he said that, after having carefully read the writings that had been criticised, he had come to the conclusion that the bishop designate could repeat the Creeds *ex animo*. Dr. Henson, of course, hotly protested against there being any doubt about his position, and the Archbishop thereupon replied to Dr. Gore in a long letter, in which he said :

‘ I have, as you know, always maintained that, in the last resort, a large measure of responsibility must belong to the ecclesiastical authorities, and especially to the Archbishop of the province, in regard to the filling of a vacant

see by the consecration thereto of a priest duly nominated by the Crown. It is therefore appropriate that you should write to me as you have written on a matter about which you feel so strongly. No constitutional rule or usage can force the Archbishop to the solemn act of consecration, if he be prepared, by resignation or otherwise, to abide the consequences of declaring himself *in foro conscientiae* unable to proceed. I should be deliberately prepared to take that course if I found myself called upon at any time to consecrate to the episcopate a man who, in my judgment, is clearly unworthy of that office, or false to the Christian faith as taught by the Church of England.

‘Dr. Hensley Henson has now, on the nomination of the Crown, been duly elected by the Chapter of Hereford. I have personal knowledge of the care taken by some at least of the prebendaries, who voted for him, to satisfy themselves as to his teaching, and I am informed that, of the nineteen members of the Chapter who took part in the proceedings, all but four voted in his favour. I do not say that the fact of his formal election finally disposes of all question as to his consecration : I mention

it because it is an important step in the procedure. I have now, by the help of God, to exercise my own responsibility to the best of my power.

‘ You call upon me to refuse consecration to Dr. Henson. You rest your protest simply on his published writings. These extend over many years, during which he has held positions of considerable importance in the Church of England, and has therefore been liable to formal proceedings in case of heresy or false teaching. To the best of my belief, no such accusation has ever been formulated against him in such manner as to enable it to be authoritatively tested.

‘ During the last few weeks I have read with care most of Dr. Henson’s published books, and, since receiving your protest, I have re-read with close attention all the passages to which your protest refers. Taking them, as in fairness they must be taken, with their full context, I find opinions expressed with which I definitely disagree: I find in some pages a want of balance and a crudity of abrupt statement which may give satisfaction, or even help, to certain minds or temperaments, but must inevitably be painful, and possibly even dangerous, to others.

I find what seem to me to be almost irreconcilable inconsistencies. I find much that seems to me to need explanation, qualification or re-statement. But the result of my consideration of the whole matter—and it has not been slight or hurried—is that neither in Dr. Henson's books, nor in the careful communications which have taken place between him and myself on the subject, have I found anything which, when it is fairly weighed in its true setting, I can regard as inconsistent with the belief which he firmly asserts in the facts and doctrines of the faith as set forth in the Creeds. Some of the collections of isolated extracts from his writings, as sent to me by correspondents, are even more than usually unfair.

‘I am bold to say that no fair-minded man can read consecutively a series of Dr. Henson's sermons without feeling that we have in him a brilliant and powerful teacher of the Christian faith, who regards the Incarnation of the Son of God as the central fact of human history, who accepts without qualification the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, and who brings these supreme realities to bear with persuasive force upon the daily problems and perplexities of human life. That he also has a singular power of effectively

presenting the Gospel message to the hearts of a congregation of quite ordinary and untheological people is a fact of which I have personal knowledge and experience.'

This letter is a very important pronouncement. Dr. Davidson admits that no power on earth can force the Archbishop 'to the solemn act of consecration,' and since a bishop receives his ghostly authority, not when he is nominated or when he is elected, but when he is consecrated, it is obvious that the ultimate responsibility for the institution of every diocesan rests, not with the Crown, but with the high dignitaries of the Church. No episcopal appointment in recent years has been so criticised as the selection of Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham. Dr. Barnes was nominated by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald during the brief life of the Labour Government, and this nomination has been constantly used as an argument against the present manner in which the bishops of the English Church are appointed. But the Archbishop, six years before, had boldly confessed that he, and not the Prime Minister, must be condemned for any heretical appointment. He had deliberately protested that he would be prepared to face the consequences, and to refuse to consecrate any

man who, in his judgment, was 'false to the Christian faith as taught by the Church of England.' He made it clear in his letter to Dr. Gore that he did not consider that Dr. Henson was false to the Christian faith as taught by the Church of England, and it is to be inferred that he also found that Dr. Barnes, a far more 'advanced' teacher, was also not false to the faith of the Church.

It is interesting to compare the letter to Dr. Gore with the letter written to Dr. Barnes in 1927. There is the same freedom of criticism. 'A crudity of statement' is a delightful description of much Modernist writing. 'Irreconcilable inconsistency' is the constant characteristic of men who qualify the Christian Creeds while they accept the Christian ministry; but the Archbishop again made it clear that it was his deliberate intention to prevent heresy-hunting, and to retain in the fold of the Church men of brilliant gifts, however eccentric or extreme their teaching may be. The letter to Dr. Gore came from the pen of the consistent apostle of comprehensiveness.

Dr. Davidson has certainly not remained 'the Broad Low Churchman.' For ritual and ceremony he has no taste and little patience. He was bred a definite Liberal in matters of theology and he has remained a Liberal. His Presbyterian

upbringing has caused him fully to understand the Nonconformist position, and, in a sense, to sympathise with it, but he has never wavered in his loyalty to the essential claims of the Church of England. He has had, in his later years, a very real sense of the Church as such, differing vitally from that of the Liberals of his youth, even though he has greater understanding of sacramentalism. 'Mark my words,' said an aged Church dignitary when the Archbishop went to Canterbury, 'Davidson will be a twentieth century Tait.' A Tait he may have been, but far less narrow and far more tolerant.

Referring to the influence of such ecclesiastics as Hooker, Andrewes and Overall, he has said :

'Those men secured for us, not the title to an Apostolic ministry, for that we inherited, but the belief in such a ministry and the careful preservation of it, and the consciousness of the gifts which the possession of it bestows. Secured, appreciated and accepted thus, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the Church are ours with a fullness and a certainty which it is impossible to overstate.'

The Archbishop has been keenly anxious to emphasise the fact that the Church of England holds the primitive faith and is in accord with the primitive Church. In a sermon preached on the

eight-hundredth anniversary of the building of Ely Cathedral he said :

‘ In the largest and deepest sense those men of old and we are at one. The Creed which we have repeated to-day was their Creed. Our worship, our Sacraments, were theirs. Our actual Liturgy was, in its main features, theirs also. And we hold to, and magnify, and try to strengthen and fulfil, the very purpose which they had when, with patient toil, and with skill almost incredible, they reared on the Isle of Ely one of the noblest houses of God in the world. Yes, in the large main lines we and they are at one.’

His attitude of mind to the Reformation is summarised in his reference to ‘ the rough, the deplorable, but, in the long run, the wholesome strifes and strivings of three hundred or four hundred years ago.’ The history of the Christian religion certainly does not begin for Archbishop Davidson, as it would appear to begin for many Protestants, in the sixteenth century, and he probably does not count Thomas Cromwell among the greater prophets. He regards the Reformation as an event not to be deplored, but for which men should be sincerely grateful to God. He is no fundamentalist and no obscurantist. His theory of comprehensiveness would secure inclusion in

the Church of England of Modernists as well as of Evangelicals, and of not too enthusiastic Catholics. He has always pleaded and worked for toleration, but there is a limit to the toleration which he is willing to sanction. That has been made quite clear in his relations with Anglo-Catholics, and, although he has only gibed with gentle satire at the teaching of Dr. Barnes, and has had no public condemnation for Dr. Major, there is a passage in one of his sermons which suggests that he sets a limit to the endurable negations of the Modernists. He said at the Church Congress in 1907 :

‘ Tolerance, rightly understood, means a respect for freedom of opinion in others. We must take care that it does not set up a standard of its own as applied to ourselves, and establish what has been called “an orthodoxy of latitudinarianism which may not be spoken against.” The Church of Christ has been put in trust with a sacred deposit of essential truth which God has in Jesus Christ revealed to man, and no respect for other people’s opinions, much less any mere good-natured and almost careless kindness, will justify us in tampering with that deposit or belittling its unique authority. To those who claim an absolutely unfettered and irresponsible freedom of

speculation the Church of Christ will often seem intolerant, because, so far as the Church itself is concerned, the holding of its accepted Creed denies or limits that irresponsible claim. Of those who, as Churchmen, make such a claim, a French thinker has well said, "They confuse the right of the individual to be free with the duty of the institution to be something."'

With Dr. Davidson's love for the middle way, Dr. Barnes and Dr. Major, as well as Dr. Weston and Dr. Darwell Stone, must have often seemed to have suffered from *trop de zèle*.

CHAPTER VII

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND AFTER

THE Archbishop's principal preoccupation in the years that immediately followed the war was the Lambeth Conference of 1920, which was attended by two hundred and fifty-two 'Archbishops and bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England.' They included the English diocesans and their suffragans and four retired bishops, though Dr. Gore did not attend; ten Irish bishops, six Welsh bishops, seven Scottish bishops, a full representation of the Churches of India, South Africa, Canada, Australia and the United States, with missionary bishops from the outer marches. The Archbishop of Canterbury presided, and where he presides he dominates.

It was a strangely interesting assemblage. Frank Weston sat in the fourth row opposite the Archbishop, with Dr. Guy Warman, then the Bishop of Truro and a pronounced Evangelical, by his side, and near by was Dr. Hensley Henson, whose alleged heretical views Frank Weston had

so vehemently attacked. The Conference discussed many subjects, but reunion was its principal interest. To a considerable number of the bishops present, and perhaps to the Archbishop himself, reunion meant what would be, in effect, the absorption by the Anglican Communion of the Protestant sects. But the Anglo-Catholics, led by Frank Weston, were determined that nothing should be done, if they could help it, which would compromise the Church of England and make reunion with Rome more difficult.

On 30th July the Reunion Committee presented its report. The Archbishop opened the proceedings with solemn words of warning and admonition. In the subsequent debate, voices were heard 'from every part of the world,' and at last the committee's suggestions were carried by an overwhelming majority. Then, wrote the authors of *Lambeth and Reunion*, 'instinctively the bishops stood in silent thanksgiving until, led by one of their number, they joined in the Doxology, the Doxology bequeathed to the Church by an Anglican bishop. . . . For weal or woe, the Conference of 1920 had made the contribution to the life of the Church by which mainly in after years it will be judged. The bishops had tried honestly, without prejudice, to discover and to follow the Will of

God. The wind had been blowing, a rushing mighty wind.' And for its direction and its force the Archbishop, though not himself a member of the Sub-Committee on Reunion, was certainly largely responsible.

The most important of the clauses of the reunion proposals contained in the 'Appeal To All Christian Peoples' were as follows :

' We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

' We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act, this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognised officers,

using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

‘ This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day. On the one hand, there are other ancient episcopal communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand, there are the great non-episcopal communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organised in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.’

It was realised that reunion on the lines suggested must entail re-ordination in many cases, and this has been the cause of Nonconformist hesitation and the reason why the Appeal has had so

limited an effect. But, while the bishops by implication insisted on re-ordination of others, they were willing to submit to re-ordination themselves: 'We who send forth this Appeal would say that, if the authorities of other communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, the terms of reunion having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations as having its place in the one family life.'

As it was perfectly well known that the Protestant Dissenters do not question the right of the Anglican priest to regard himself as an authorised minister of the Word, it was assumed that this offer was a direct approach to the Church of Rome, and, indeed, it was so regarded by the Roman representatives at the Malines Conversations.

Frank Weston was perfectly clear that there had been no compromise of essential Catholic principle in the Lambeth Appeal. He wrote in the *Church Times*: 'It safeguards the claims of the Anglican ministry to be, in the historical sense, truly Catholic. It warns bishops not to allow their flocks to accept Holy Communion from men not episcopally ordained, and it condemns schemes

of intercommunion and interchange of pulpits.

‘ However gentle their language in the Appeal, the bishops will not accept non-episcopal ministry as within the universal ministry. Fully as they perceive God’s grace in such ministries, they are true to the trust of episcopacy committed to them.’

Of whom was the Archbishop thinking when he submitted the reunion resolutions to the bishops at Lambeth? Frank Weston, influencing and almost dominating the assemblage by the force of his character, had his eyes turned towards Rome ; but, while the Archbishop may have had thoughts of Constantinople, he was more intent on Geneva ; yet, in so far as the Appeal was primarily addressed to English Nonconformists and Continental Protestants, it was made abortive by the insistence that an episcopal ministry was Divinely instituted. From the beginning this assumption was repudiated by the Nonconformist leaders, and in the long negotiations that have taken place during the past eight years it has become more and more obvious that, while there might be a guarded and qualified recognition that episcopacy, defined and hampered, may be the ideal form of Church government, re-ordination, with its admission that a ministry has hitherto been unauthorised, will never be accepted.

Another Lambeth Conference is to meet in 1930, and vigorous efforts are to be made so to modify the episcopal claim as to bring reunion in England and in the mission field into the realm of practical politics. Dr. Davidson will no longer be Archbishop of Canterbury when that Conference meets. Frank Weston is dead. And no man can predict what the decisions will be.

The second of the Archbishop's preoccupations of the post-war years was the launching of the National Assembly, the conduct through the Assembly of a large number of important proposals, many of them very partially discussed and only half considered, and, finally, the long-drawn-out debate on the Prayer Book revision proposals.

In 1914, the Archbishop appointed a committee of twenty-six members, of which Lord Selborne was the President, to enquire into the relations between the State and the Church and to suggest how, while maintaining the State connection, the Church could secure a large measure of self-government. Among the members of the committee were Mr. Arthur Balfour—now Lord Balfour—Lord Hugh Cecil, Lord Parmoor, Sir Lewis Dibdin and Dr. Frere. The committee reported in the summer of 1916, but nothing was done until after the end of the war.

In the spring of 1919 the Enabling Act, which brought the National Assembly into existence and which was based on the report of Lord Selborne's committee, was introduced into the House of Lords. In moving the second reading on the 3rd of June, the Archbishop pointed out that in the sixteenth century the Church and the nation were coterminous, but that Parliament was no longer identical with the laity of the Church. 'A new vein had been tapped,' he said, 'often an auriferous vein.' The time of Parliament was now fully occupied. It was far too busy to be much concerned with the troubles of the Church and the reforms that she needed, and some new machinery was necessary by which the Church could legislate for itself with, of course, the approval of Parliament and the Crown. It was significant that, in alluding to the needed reforms, the Archbishop referred specifically to Ecclesiastical Courts and ecclesiastical discipline, and that he said nothing of Prayer Book revision. The second reading was opposed by Lord Haldane, because he contended the Bill would exclude the greater part of the people of England from effective influence in the affairs of the National Church, and he predicted that it would be 'the death-warrant of the establishment.' In this, Lord

Haldane may well prove to have been a reliable prophet.

The Enabling Act was carried in the House of Lords by a majority of 130 to 33, and in the House of Commons by a majority of 304 to 16. Outside Parliament it was opposed by, among others, Dr. Knox and Dr. Hensley Henson—a queer combination, in view of the happenings of the last three years—on the Erastian ground that the creation of the National Assembly would modify Parliament's effective supervision of the Church.

It is not possible here to discuss how far the Assembly has proved of benefit to the Church. Country vicars suffering from the results of the Tithe Act, which the Assembly passed and Parliament affirmed, have very definite opinions on the subject. Nor is it possible to catalogue the enactments of the Assembly, which the Archbishop has approved. It is sometimes suggested that the Assembly—a body created by Parliament, but without the smallest canonical authority—has succeeded in acquiring powers that belong of right to the Convocations, and that the Archbishop has acquiesced in the loss of prestige to the ancient governing body of the Church, which every Erastian, from Dean Stanley downwards,

has decried. But that, again, is a question irrelevant to my purpose. The National Assembly has been chiefly concerned with the Revised Prayer Book, and to the political world the one supremely important consequence of the Enabling Act was the Prayer Book Revision Measure.

It cannot be too emphatically insisted that Prayer Book revision was from the beginning opposed by the Anglo-Catholic party. In 1889, when certain changes in the Book of Common Prayer were suggested in the *Edinburgh Review*, an organ of Erastian Whiggery, Dr. Pusey declared: 'We have never wished, nor shall we wish, for any alteration in the liturgy of our Church.' Two years later, the English Church Union, repeating the claim, always made by the Tractarians, that Catholic doctrine was implied in the Book of Common Prayer, pledged itself 'to maintain the said Book as for nearly two centuries it has stood and by God's goodness still stands.' It was the ambition of the mid-Victorian Latitudinarians to water down the doctrine of the Prayer Book so that Dissenters might be attracted back to the Church, and this was naturally resisted by Anglo-Catholics. The President and Council of the English Church Union in 1879 affirmed that 'to touch the

Prayer Book at all is most dangerous ; to bring it before Parliament is suicidal.'

The recommendation in the Report of the Ecclesiastical Commission that the Prayer Book should be revised was made with the idea that revision would hamper and curb the Catholic revival. The Archbishop subscribed to the Commission's recommendation. He was certainly its most influential member, and the policy that it recommended was assuredly his. The English Church Union was again alive to the danger, and in 1908 it condemned the proposed revision as dangerous and mischievous. Resolutions of condemnation were passed at its annual meetings in 1909, 1910 and 1911. If, therefore, there is justification—and it can hardly be said that there is no justification—for the charge that the Deposited Book approves and, in some respects, legalises Catholic practices which have always been condemned by Protestant Churchmen, then it would seem that between 1906 and 1927 the Archbishop had experienced an almost complete change of mind. In 1906 he was apparently eager to prevent what twenty-one years later he was ready to sanction.

It is impossible to ignore this change of heart in considering a great and, on the whole, a consistent

career, and there can, as it seems to me, be little difficulty in discovering why the Archbishop, with considerable reluctance, acquiesced in, if he did not initiate, a really revolutionary policy. In the speech that he made in the House of Lords on 15th December, 1927, he acknowledged that it was with difficulty that he had persuaded himself to consent to the provision for continuous Reservation. But, if he were justified in saying in 1903 that 'the sands had run out,' and that stern measures were necessary to discipline the Anglo-Catholic clergy, and presumably to prohibit Reservation, among other practices, the sands had certainly still farther run out in 1927, and the necessity for discipline, if it ever existed, was much more obvious.

But just as the Archbishop, when he was Tait's chaplain, had discovered that the Public Worship Regulation Act was a hopeless failure, and that persecution merely served to excite Catholic enthusiasm and to aid the Catholic revival, so in these later years he had discovered that the Catholic movement had grown too strong to be destroyed, and that diplomacy, in which he is an adept, convinced him that the course of wisdom was to direct the movement, and hold it in hand, so that its progress should not be too rapid nor its

development too radical. I have said before that the motto that should have been printed on the title-page of the Deposited Book should be, 'Thus far and no farther.' In 1906, the Archbishop certainly would not have agreed to 'Thus far.' In 1927 he would probably have admitted that he and his friends would be very lucky if they were able to secure 'no farther.'

CHAPTER VIII

THE SERVANT OF THE STATE

'OUR ministry is not ecclesiastical only,' the Archbishop said in a sermon in 1907; 'it has a definitely assigned place in the national life. The oath of allegiance to the King taken by us, and by us alone among ordained men, is a recurrent reminder of our responsibilities to realm as well as Church, of our official citizenship and what it means.' The Archbishop is not only the official head of the English Church, in practice much more than *primus inter pares*, he is also the first subject of the Kingdom of Great Britain. He has never shirked responsibility. He has never failed to realise the obligation for service that accompanies high position. His first citizenship has been for him a great deal more than precedence. Churchmanship and citizenship are, indeed, intimately related. His view of the Church is national. He has frequently insisted that the English Church is part of the Church Catholic, but, none the less, he has generally thought of it as the greatest of national possessions, and, in constantly striving

for the well-being of the Church, he has quite consciously been striving for what has seemed to him the well-being of the nation.

The Church must be justified by its service. It stands at the judgment-seat of the present day. Its fidelity to its eternal mission will be estimated by its influence for righteousness and justice in the ever-changing circumstances of contemporary life. With this conviction, the Archbishop has grown less and less inclined to be content merely to denounce evil. He has carefully and properly kept outside party politics, but he has insisted with increasing emphasis that the ministers and faithful laity of the Church are false to their trust and to their obligation unless they are ready to make sacrifice and to face contumely in the endeavour to make the world cleaner and happier.

The Archbishop began his life as a courtier. When he was installed Dean of Windsor he would possibly have described himself as the servant of God and of the Queen. Rochester brought him hard up against the tragedies of mean streets. He has lived through years that have seen the growing revolt against the meanness, and the organised demand for far-reaching and revolutionary changes, and he has come to regard the

revolt and the demand with a large measure of sympathy. He has deplored the dangerous suggestions of extremists, but he has been courageous enough to insist that, while evil conditions continue, violent remedies are certain to have their advocates. Preaching to the Oddfellows in 1907, he said :

‘ There is nothing really so cowardly or contemptible as the attitude which, in the face of admitted evils, will not bestir itself, lest it seem to favour wild and impossible schemes ; for, be it remembered, such schemes draw all the strength and influence that they possess from the existence of those admitted evils (impurity and greed and intemperance and the rest) which timidity will not endeavour to cure. The advocates of swift, unsparing revolution are among us, but their true mission is not to frighten us into inaction, which gives them all their force, but to make us resolve to rise to the Christian conception—namely, that it is the duty of the nation, as being itself an ordinance of God, to promote that Kingdom which was not founded on force, but on truth and righteousness, and which is never powerless, save when it forgets its watchwords. As we gain a truer conception of the claims of the Christian Church, in the widest sense of that word, so we gain a true

conception of the functions of the Christian State, and of every great brotherhood and society within its bounds.'

The last sentence is indicative of the Archbishop's mind. The Christian State can only be created by the Christian Church and, consequently, there is no part of the life of the State with which the Church is unconcerned.

But with the Archbishop, enthusiasm and even indignation have always been radically modified by caution. At the beginning of the industrial crisis of 1926, he urged on the members of the National Assembly that it should be their 'steady and continuously prayerful endeavour to foster and deepen the true spirit in which Christian people should handle these industrial questions.' He carefully avoided taking sides, but he went on to say that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners would not resist the nationalisation of mining royalties 'upon reasonable terms, if it is shown to be in the interests of the whole community,' even though nationalisation would almost inevitably mean a loss of income to the Church.

A man, more influenced by quick impulse and more given to dramatic action, might have gained a certain popularity by declaring that the Church would willingly make a great surrender in order to

relieve a troubled industry of a grievous burden. But the Archbishop thought of incumbents and curates as well as miners, and spoke with obvious apprehension of the consequences of a great loss of income.

As the crisis of two years ago developed, the Archbishop gained a greater courage and spoke far more definitely. He said in October, at the meeting of the Canterbury Diocesan Conference, that, while the general strike had been a 'wild and impossible adventure,' it was not, in his view, a deliberate political move, nor did he agree that the trade union leaders were 'the mere witless dupes of a handful of revolutionary agents.' The general strike had come to its end, but the coal strike continued. 'Are we, so to speak,' asked the Archbishop, 'simply to form a ring, and stand helplessly round hoping that the combatants will come to terms, or have we all, as citizens of a country in which coal is a key industry, an inevitable share of responsibility?' Here again he insists that there is no privilege without responsibility, and that social responsibility rests with groups of men as well as with individuals. The ten bishops who, led by Dr. Temple, had endeavoured to arrive at terms of peace, had been hotly denounced in the newspapers, and told, none too

politely, to mind their own business. The Archbishop gave them a qualified support :

‘ I have always felt it to be an extremely delicate and difficult task for devout Christian men, as such, and still more for clergy, as such, to apply what seem to them clear Christian principles to a contemporary industrial or economic problem. It is always easy and always perilous to lose sight of the fact that almost every problem of the kind—probably every single problem which arouses deep and keen controversy—has two factors, one strictly economic and the other ethical. Those who are keenly alert to moral and spiritual things are always in danger of letting the ethical factor push the other out of sight ; of ignoring, to put it bluntly, such a simple and yet profound economic principle as underlies the statement that you cannot get more than a pint out of a pint pot.

‘ The good and earnest man, who is wholly inexperienced about the economic difficulties, disabilities and possibilities of the industry concerned, has to be anxiously careful not to slip into thinking, or encouraging others to think, that if everybody was as kind and good as we are, the difficulties which occasion the conflict would vanish away. Nothing is more exasperating to a man who has full technical knowledge of an industrial problem,

and is working hard, though perhaps silently, to solve it, than to have people who have no such knowledge suggesting that, if only he were converted, there would be no difficulties left for him to solve. Such a suggestion in any form does real harm, and screens from others' sight the hard facts of the problem under discussion. It tends to exalt the heart at the expense of the head.

' The story of the growth of industry and of the changes in its conditions, during the nineteenth century, warns us off the ground of those ready judgments. Carry your mind back eighty years to the cotton looms and the coal-pits and the chimney flues of the England of that day, and to the then position of the women and children workers. How did the change come about? Was it by persistent reliance on mere obedience to what were deemed to be economic laws, or did other influences altogether come into play? We should be, indeed, the poorer had we silenced in the past, or were we to silence in the present, the voices of intelligent and earnest men, with a general—albeit an untechnical—knowledge of industrial life and its conditions, who have something to say in the matter. I refer to men who are personally on terms of friendship both with

employers and employed, and who are ready to stand forward in times of industrial crisis with a forcible reminder that hardship, if it be inevitable, must be fairly shared, and that neither party in the dispute should adopt a bluntly irreconcilable attitude and merely harden his own shell.

‘ Among men who thus have a right to speak and to be heard I should myself, without hesitation, place some at least of those who recently tried to play their part in facilitating the resumption of negotiations. On the clergy, at the most solemn moment in their lives, the obligation is laid that they are to strive—not pray only, but strive—to set forward peace among men. You will not suppose me to be saying that I necessarily agreed with all that they said. They may perhaps have gone further into technical details than was desirable or necessary, or may have made or transmitted particular suggestions which were unworkable or unwise. But I should not like this occasion to pass without expressing my belief that, while such action must always be both difficult and delicate, the country owes a debt of gratitude to the men who made that courageous endeavour.

‘ In the far graver matter of the general strike, I myself, though I had in Parliament condemned it in the strongest terms I could find, took part in

an endeavour, open obviously to easy criticism, to bring it peaceably to an end.'

Often in the Archbishop's life there has been an obvious conflict between the realist and the idealist, and this conflict is expressed in the speech from which I have quoted. The idealist insists that good men must fight against evil. The realist reminds the good men that facts are facts, and that they must be careful not to bang their heads against stone walls. It would be unfair to regard the idealist as the official exponent of a beautiful but impossible way of life and the realist as the actual Archbishop Davidson. In all men—even in Archbishops—there is Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. I hasten to add that the Archbishop's Dr. Jekyll is most attractive, and his Mr. Hyde not in the least Stevensonian.

But hear the two voices! In one of his sermons the Archbishop has said: 'The notion that there are in the social life of a great country two sets of laws and principles, one of them Christ's and the other man's; one of them belonging to what we call religion, and the other, quite independently, to political and civic and industrial life; and that the two have their quite separate spheres and are wholly independent of one another—that notion, or rather that mischievous falsehood, which used

once to be held by many good people, is now, I hope, for ever banished from the creed of men and women who believe in Jesus Christ and His messages.' There is only one law, only one standard, only one set of rules. But can these rules always be followed? The Archbishop has not always been sure. I quote from another sermon :

' There are few more difficult questions in the range of Christian politics than the question how far the rules which indisputably govern the relations of two Christian men are applicable in like manner to the relations of Christian States and peoples. Startling and unwelcome as it sounds to say so, it is, I suppose, certain that we cannot apply to the intercourse and mutual relations of nations, as such, the selfsame rules which we should apply to the intercourse and mutual relations of two Christian men. The law of humility and meekness, the law of self-sacrifice, nay, even the law of forgiveness, must, I suppose, when nations are concerned, have a somewhat different application from that which would be right as between individual man and man. This is, I think, true teaching ; for, after all, what we call the action of a nation means in itself the action of a sovereign or statesman on behalf of other people, whose

interests he, as a Christian, must protect and care for.'

Unequivocally to have declared that 'the law of humility and meekness,' which the Christian Church insists shall be followed by the individual, should also be followed by the nation would have compelled the Archbishop to be numbered with the Pacifists when war was declared in August 1914. He was, on the contrary, vehement in his assertions that the intervention of Great Britain in the war was inevitable, and that, so far as she and her Allies were concerned, the war was a righteous war. It would be monstrous to judge any man by his utterances during the hectic years of illusion. But this may be said not unfairly of the Archbishop. His sermons in the war years were dignified, his actions were patriotic, but there was no evidence of real vision. He emphatically repudiated the awful theory that war has been devised by God as 'a dreadful medicine for the human race.' On the contrary, 'we believe,' he said, 'that war is always due to some aberration from the will of Almighty Love by one or both parties to that war.' None the less, 'the true lover of peace is the only man who grasps aright the insistent and high meaning of peace.'

I have taken these passages from different

sermons. There is always a danger of misrepresentation in such quotations taken from their context, but they certainly suggest a confusion of thought, the clash between realist and idealist, the attempt to defend the indefensible.

But with the rest of the world the Archbishop saw, throughout the war, as through a glass darkly. The conflict, he said, 'involved the largest principles of conduct, the simplest issues of right and wrong.' That was said in 1915. In 1928 we know something of the complexities—the horrid and mean complexities—which were really involved.

In his New Year's message for 1916, the Archbishop suggested that good might come out of evil, a suggestion which has as its possible corollary the implication that evil may be Divinely intentioned because of its good result. He wrote: 'The persistence of so much that is brave and buoyant in face of the unending sacrifice is itself a standing witness of the power and love of God.' Without definite qualification, this is a very dangerous belief, though the fact that the most searching trial and the most awful suffering cannot destroy either the courage or the humour of the sons of men proves they have been created only a little lower than the angels.

Six months afterwards, in a speech to the Canterbury Diocesan Conference, the Archbishop referred to the appeals that had been made to him to use all his influence in the cause of peace. These appeals were doubtless occasioned by Lord Lansdowne's plea that stalemate had occurred on the battlefield and that the time was ripe for peace negotiations. But the Archbishop was convinced that to talk of peace with an enemy still obdurate was 'flimsy sentimentality,' and he declared that he could find as yet no basis on which 'to encourage or justify approaching those with whom the nation was at war with proposals of peace.'

But men were growing weary and hopeless ; God seemed to have deserted His world. And the English episcopate, moved by the often-repeated criticisms that the Church had failed in the years of travail, launched in 1916 what was rather grandiloquently called the National Mission of Repentance and Hope. The sense of failure was general and not unnatural. The war went on, with its accumulation of death and financial loss, and no man could predict its end. Sanity appeared to be driven from European society. Generals failed, politicians wrangled, and the Church was impotent to help. In every nation the priests and the bishops were just religious nationalists,

loudly proclaiming that their brothers were dying in the cause of God, and the one great ecclesiastic, who could speak with international authority, remained hesitant and silent. Men were cynically impatient. Walter Carey, the present Bishop of Bloemfontein, who was then serving as a naval chaplain, wrote a series of vehement articles which he called 'The Standard of Revolt.' Anglicanism must slough off its respectability and conventionality. Prebendary Mackay followed, denouncing the Christian teaching that concerned itself with the identity of Moses' uncle. The world was hungry for bold and inspiring spiritual leadership. It cannot be pretended that it received it from Canterbury. The National Mission of Repentance and Hope induced little repentance and inspired little hope. It was too colourless and indefinite, and achieved little of any permanent value; and, judging from the Archbishop's speeches, he had little faith that it would succeed in revolutionising the England of the war years. It was well-intentioned, mild and ineffective.

A few months ago the present Archbishop of Canterbury declared that, for all its suffering, the war was worth while. Archbishop Davidson was, and maybe still is, of the same opinion. 'We have given our very best and bravest, and before

God we believe it is worth while.' 'These gallant lives, these brave and willing deaths, are not in vain. England and the Empire can thank God as well as take courage.' 'We all know it has been worth while, it is worth while ; we have lived through large days, large doings, at a great juncture in the history of mankind.'

It is easy to be wise after the event. Few men now, with any knowledge of the ruin that the war has brought, can think of it as anything but a colossally wicked blunder, caused, not by a double dose of original sin in any nation or in any one individual, but by world-wide crass stupidity and shortsightedness.

The Archbishop constantly urged that the men, engaged in what to him was a great and righteous crusade, should be inspired by the crusader's spirit. There must be no hatred, though there may be righteous anger. 'We have to be sternly on our guard lest in setting right one great wrong we drift into another, and lest in our restless and even fretful anxiety to be doing or saying something that will count we allow anger to degenerate into a baser spirit.'

The war came to an end at long last. The League of Nations was in the throes of its birth, and the Archbishop gave it his blessing, but not,

as it would seem, with a faith that would move mountains. 'I speak here to-day,' he said on the Day of Thanksgiving in St. Paul's Cathedral, 'as one who, believing in our Master's promise, is bold to maintain—despite all our qualms; despite, nay, because of our experience—that in His good time the ending of war between Christian peoples is a thing attainable.'

'Out of the horrid crucible of war,' the Archbishop predicted, there must emerge 'truer knowledge of good and evil, a more keen appraising of our standards of conduct as peoples or as men and women.'

But that is exactly what has not emerged.

There remains to consider the Archbishop's connection with education, in his function as servant of the Church and of the State.

Since the beginning of the renewal of learning, the Church has been the persistent friend of education. The Universities were created by the piety of Churchmen, and, long before the State realised its responsibility for the education of its poorer citizens, the Church was supplying a certain amount of book-learning to the people. In the early years of the eighteenth century, Blue Coat Schools were founded by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. The National

Society was created in 1809, and in 1831 there were 13,000 Church elementary schools in England and Wales. In 1870, the Forster Education Act was introduced into Parliament, not to replace the Church schools, but 'to complete the voluntary system and to fill up gaps.' But that Act, in the notorious Cowper-Temple clause, emphasised the difference between Church schools and State schools, for by that clause it was enacted that in schools supported by the rates 'no religious catechism or religious formulary of any particular denomination shall be taught.' It should be added that Gladstone believed that this clause would not prevent the teaching of the Apostles' Creed, but, in his criticism of the Forster Act, Disraeli made the very striking assertion that 'a religion without formularies is a new religion,' a statement which Mr. Hilaire Belloc has repeated in different words. 'Religion resides in dogma,' he says; 'loyalty must express itself in a creed.' Disraeli's statement has been proved by experience, for the formless and colourless religion of the English elementary schools is a new and strange thing, satisfactory to no one and, from its very indefiniteness, incapable of influencing character or conduct.

The voluntary schools, mainly attached either

to the English or Roman Catholic Churches, were obviously handicapped as against the rate-aided schools created by the Act of 1870, though there was no question that they were an invaluable part of the system of national education. It was therefore recommended in 1897 by a Commission, of which Lord Cross was the chairman, that rate aid should, in certain conditions, be given to the voluntary schools, and this was the main enactment of the Education Act introduced into Parliament by the Balfour Government in 1902, a year before Dr. Davidson began his primacy. This Act was fiercely contested and bitterly resented by the Nonconformists, who, after its passage, began a campaign of passive resistance, refusing to pay rates, part of which were to be used in the endowment of what they denounced as denominational teaching. Dr. Clifford's cuckoo clock was sold by public auction, and the agitation was fully advertised and exploited, with the consequence that, when a Liberal Government was returned to power at the general election of 1905, there was a loud demand for the modification and amendment of the Act of 1902.

Mr. Birrell was the Education Minister, and an amended Education Bill was introduced into

the Commons on 9th April, 1906. The Archbishop at once protested against its enactments in a letter to King Edward, though he declared that he was eager to do everything to arrive at 'an amicable, reasonable and permanent solution.' The King agreed with the Archbishop's criticisms. 'The Bill,' he wrote, 'is most unfair and dangerous, and, instead of smoothing matters, will produce violent dissensions between the Church of England and Roman Catholics on one side and the Non-conformists on the other. In fact, a kind of political religious warfare will ensue which is most undesirable, especially just now.'

The Bill passed the House of Commons, to be drastically amended in the House of Lords, and the two Houses were in sharp conflict. The King endeavoured to engineer some sort of compromise, and the Archbishop and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Prime Minister, met in confidential consultation at Windsor, the Archbishop being subsequently invited to attend Cabinet conferences on the Bill. The Archbishop wrote: 'I have no wish to be unreasonable or unaccommodating in any negotiations, provided we can avoid any grave sacrifice of principle and any intolerable public wrong.' But he insisted that teachers should not be prevented from giving—if

they were willing to do so—distinctive religious teaching, and this the Liberal Government would not accept. Compromise was found impossible. The Lords refused to pass the Bill, and this was the first step in the struggle which came to its conclusion with the Parliament Bill and the drastic curtailment of the powers of the second Chamber.

In 1908, the Liberal Government made two attempts to settle the education controversy. Neither of the Bills that they introduced was acceptable to the Church or to the House of Lords, but the Archbishop was, as always, notably conciliatory. Mr. Runciman, who had become Education Minister, reported to the King's secretary: 'The Archbishop writes me that he is now able to report that the bishops on the whole are in favour of a settlement of the education controversy now. Some of his colleagues have raised insurmountable points, and at their adjourned meeting this morning the Archbishop, I understand, is endeavouring to overcome these difficulties.' The endeavour failed. His suffragans were less conciliatory than the Primate, and the education problem remained as it was for another nine years.

In 1917, Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, Education Minister

in the Coalition Government, introduced an Education Bill and conducted a series of negotiations with representatives of the Church and the Nonconformist bodies to arrive at 'an agreed scheme' on the question of religious education. Conciliation was in the air. The Irish Convention had come to its successful end, and the war had made internal strife of any sort unpopular, and even indecent. The Archbishop was warmly in favour of the settlement, which was also approved by the Consultative Committee of the National Society. But the scheme was wrecked, first by the National Union of Teachers, which objected to any religious qualification for teachers in any rate-aided school, and secondly by the Roman Catholic authorities, who felt unable to make any sort of concession.

Later, a scheme very much on the lines of Mr. Fisher's was approved by the Church Assembly, and again the Archbishop was hopeful. But a new opposition arose in the shape of a diehard party in the Church, led by Prebendary Thicknesse, the Vicar of St. George's, Hanover Square, who were eager at all costs to preserve the Church schools in their independence, or semi-independence, and who, unlike the Archbishop, were willing to ignore the duty of ensuring a more or less

adequate religious teaching for the tens of thousands of Church children who attend the provided schools.

At the end of his primacy, the position of the Church schools is far weaker than it was when Dr. Davidson was installed Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1903, forty-five per cent. of the children of this country were in Council schools and fifty-five per cent. in Church schools. In 1923, sixty-two per cent. were in Council schools and only thirty-eight per cent. in Church schools ; and with the new arrangement, which removes children at eleven to a higher grade school, in a very few years the Church will have none but infants and juniors under its care. The Church schools, indeed, are slowly going under. Fewer and fewer teachers are coming from Church training colleges, and there has been infinite loss to the Church from the failure to recognise, as the Archbishop has always recognised, that the Church owes a duty to all its children and not merely to the lessening members who attend Church schools. Ten years ago it might have been possible to have found the way to fulfil this duty through the abrogation of the Cowper-Temple clause.

A distinguished educationalist, who has been

intimately concerned with Church schools for the last five-and-twenty years, writes: 'Speaking generally of the Archbishop's work as a Church educationalist, I should say that he has been immensely keen, that he has a wide knowledge and a grasp of the facts, but that his natural leaning towards diplomacy and confidential conversations in back rooms, rather than to direct and courageous leadership, caused him to miss the real chance that he had in 1918, and when he tried again he was torpedoed by Prebendary Thicknesse and his friends, who had contrived to identify their standpoint with Anglo-Catholicism. Church education is a thing that the Archbishop has always had immensely at heart. He has given himself to it unsparingly, and his failure has been due chiefly to his temperament.'

The born negotiator sometimes fails when the born fighter would succeed.

CHAPTER IX

THE LAST FIVE YEARS

It has happened to me to have a close and intimate knowledge of the events of the last five years of Dr. Davidson's primacy, in many ways its most critical and important years. Circumstances have enabled me to come down from the gallery to the stalls, where the onlooker sees and hears more clearly and is able to appreciate more acutely the development of the drama. I can make no claim to any intimate personal acquaintance with the Archbishop, but the half-dozen or so private talks I have had with him were, I am bold to suggest, illuminative of his character and of his determination to arrive at a personal judgment, not only of all the phases of the life of the Church, but also of the quality of all the men in any sort of responsible position. Within a very few hours of the announcement of my appointment to the position of some responsibility which I now hold, I was invited to Canterbury, where I had a long personal talk with the Archbishop. I was immensely impressed by his strength. There was

nothing about him that suggested an old or a weary man. He was incisive, definite and acute. I thought then, and I think now, that he is the greatest man with whom I have ever talked; born to leadership, accepting leadership, with all its wearying anxieties, as his proper heritage.

We talked a good deal of Malines during this afternoon at Canterbury in the late autumn of 1923, and the Archbishop was obviously anxious to make me understand that his was the direct responsibility for the fact that Anglican divines had sat in conference with distinguished representatives of the Roman Church, and that it was a responsibility which his brother bishops only indirectly shared.

Malines and the Prayer Book have overshadowed the conclusion of the Archbishop's primacy. The Malines Conversations were the proper result of the call for reunion addressed to the whole of Christendom by the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

To the Archbishop, the differences that separate Christians into wrangling sects have always seemed absurd, and with Stanley in the last century, and Dr. Headlam in this, he would have the National Church as comprehensive as the nation. His sense of dignity and propriety has prevented him from prejudicing his sacred office by those

philanderings with Nonconformists which have become popular among some of the lesser of his brethren, but he has never felt himself cut off from Nonconformity by essential principles. He has probably never thought of himself as selected by Divine Providence for the office that he has held, in any other way than the President of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection has been selected by Divine Providence for his office. And being, in all respects, a realist and an opportunist, he can hardly have supposed that the condition laid down at Lambeth that Nonconformist bodies must accept episcopal government, and that Nonconformist ministers must submit to reordination, would have proved an insuperable bar to reunion. It must have puzzled him that these conditions have appeared to the majority of Nonconformists as a betrayal of those principles which induced their predecessors to secede from the National Church.

The Archbishop has been for many years immensely interested in the welfare of the Eastern Churches, and anxious for an *entente* between Anglicans and the Orthodox. At his invitation, the Œcumenical Patriarch sent a delegation to Lambeth in 1920. But the Archbishop has been faced by the apparently insuperable difficulty that

conditions which would make reunion with Constantinople possible must make reunion with Geneva impossible. That was made perfectly clear by the Orthodox delegation at Lausanne, and was repeated with admirable candour by Archbishop Germanos at the Church Congress at Cheltenham.

I do not believe for one moment that Dr. Davidson has ever considered the reunion of Canterbury and Rome as within the range of practical politics. But it would have been clearly monstrous that in its plea for reunion the Lambeth Conference should have ignored the greatest of all Christian Churches ; and, indeed, the presence of Dr. Frank Weston would alone have made that impossible. Subsequently the Archbishop was compelled to extend his benevolent approval to the Malines Conversations, which were initiated by Cardinal Mercier, the Abbé Portal and Lord Halifax.

To the Archbishop, Rome appears 'obdurate and unyielding,' and, while good manners and a sense of proportion compelled the inclusion of the great Church of the West in the Lambeth invitation, and, though the Archbishop may never have regarded reunion with Rome as anything more than a pious dream, it is the very essence of the

man that he is disinclined finally to rule out any possibility. Referring to the general attitude of the Vatican, he has said : ' I am not prepared to say that there are no signs of such movement as may come to produce new and perhaps unexpected tentacles of approach. If such there be, I can at least promise that I shall not willingly be either blind or insensitive to their slightest throb.' An admirable sentiment, compromising him to nothing. There was some discussion at Malines as to whether some day the Archbishop of Canterbury would again receive the *pallium* from the Pope. But Dr. Davidson with a papal *pallium* is an unthinkable fantasy.

I cannot conceive anything that could happen in this world more calculated to further righteousness and the welfare of the human race than the return of the English Church to its pre-Reformation relations with the Church of the West, but he must indeed have been an enthusiast, with a faith which would have moved mountains, who believed that the Malines Conversations could possibly eventualise in anything more than a quickening of mutual sympathy and an increase of mutual knowledge. It was perfectly obvious that Rome could not make important concessions without abdicating its historic claims, and it was

equally obvious that Canterbury could not make the required submission without, in the circumstances of the English Church, assuring its breaking into fragments. Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal unquestionably believed that Malines would achieve much more than it has achieved. Cardinal Mercier may have shared their faith, but I doubt whether either Monseigneur Battifol on the one side, or Dr. Frere, Dr. Gore and Dr. Kidd on the other, had any such illusion. The Archbishop certainly had not ; and it seems to me perfectly fair to assume that he permitted the conversations, facing the certainty of hostile criticism and even denunciation, because he knew full well that they must fail, and that they would merely serve to emphasise the impossibility of the reunion that Lord Halifax and a large section of the Anglo-Catholic party desired. It was complained by Cardinal Mercier that the Archbishop was careful to avoid any definite statement. Of course he was. He was anxious, as I believe, that the conversations should not stop when they were a partial success, but should go on until their failure was unmistakable.

It was suggested, and not unfairly, that the Anglican delegation at Malines was representative of a section of the Church of England, and not of

the Church as a whole, and the Archbishop was criticised by more or less moderate men for permitting this sectional representation—calculated, as it was, to give the Roman Catholics an entirely false idea of the character of the English Church—and by violent Protestants for countenancing any sort of friendly meeting with the servants of the Pope. The Archbishop replied at length to his critics in the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation in February 1924. He said :

‘The controversy, and even clamour, which has arisen about these conversations is due, I suppose, to the rarity of such incidents. It would be difficult to find a former occasion when opportunity has been given for quiet interchange of opinion or restatement of facts on the part of a joint group of expert theologians, Roman Catholic and Anglican. Accordingly, as soon as I had made public the fact that these informal conversations had been held, the statement was twisted or exaggerated into an announcement that secret negotiations were in progress, under the Archbishop of Canterbury’s leadership, for the reunion of the Church of England with the Church of Rome. As regards secrecy—an allegation upon which much has been made to turn—I took the first available opportunity for publicity, stating in

the simplest way what had happened. This was on purpose to avoid the growth of misunderstandings, based on ill-informed rumour, which might become current. I told the story with absolute simplicity and straightforwardness. You may have seen that Cardinal Mercier, in a Pastoral Letter published a few days ago, a copy of which he has kindly sent to me, has done the same, and I need hardly say that his narrative corresponds closely with my own. So far as Convocation is concerned, I should be quite satisfied to leave the matter there, for I have no reason to fear that there is the least misunderstanding on the part of any member of either House.

‘ But comments and criticisms from outside have been abundant. The comments may be divided into three groups. There are first those (and they are very many) who, either in public speeches or in letters to myself, have expressed complete satisfaction with what I have tried to do, and what I have abstained from doing. I have abundant letters to that effect from Anglicans at home and overseas, and from leading Scotch Presbyterians, from leading English Nonconformists, and from public men whose denominational position I do not know. The second group of criticisms (if the word is not too mild) comes

from men and women expressing a fear or an indignation based apparently upon some complete misrepresentation of the facts. These denounce me as having "betrayed the Church," or "sold the pass," or "bowed down to idolatry," or "headed a secret conspiracy against the truth of God." The best answer to these controversialists is silence, for it is impossible to deal with arguments based, not on facts, but on imaginations.

'There is, however, a third group, consisting of more or less thoughtful men and women, whose loyalty to Protestant principles makes them fearful of anything which looks to them like an approach towards friendship with the Church of Rome, and who believe me to have harmed by my action or inaction the Church of England which they love.'

The Archbishop went on to explain that the conversations had begun 'almost fortuitously.' 'It is doubtless the fact,' he added, 'that if I had desired to do so I might, so to speak, have stamped out the very suggestion of such a conversation taking place, however informally.' But such action on his part 'would have belied the appeal which the Lambeth Conference had made in the widest possible terms "to all Christian people" for the furtherance of a wider unity of the Church of Christ on earth.' And he went on,

with obviously intentioned emphasis: 'To me the quenching of smoking flax by the stamping out of an endeavour to discuss thus privately our differences would—I say it unhesitatingly—have seemed to be a sin against God.'

From the beginning both Rome and Canterbury had 'official cognisance' of the conversations. After the second meeting at Malines, the Archbishop's connection with the conversations was more direct. He said in his speech in Convocation:

'After the second conference had taken place, a wish was expressed on both sides that the number of those taking part in the conversations should be a little extended. The point at issue, or at least one of the great and far-reaching matters which I was anxious should be adequately handled, was the question of papal authority as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. Feeling the importance of this, I said that in my view it would be well that Bishop Gore and Dr. Kidd, as two of our divines who had given closest attention to this subject, should be added to the group. I asked the five men who were accordingly going to Malines for the third group of conversations to meet me at Lambeth, when, without giving any formal direction or insisting upon any particular agenda paper, I urged the necessity of its

being made quite clear what is our well-established and coherent Anglican position as set forth by our great divines. This corresponds exactly to what we have throughout endeavoured to do in our conversations with our Free Church friends in England. I found everyone to be in complete accord with me on the matter.

‘The third conference—or, rather, group of conversations—took place, and there the matter stands. Let me repeat—for the reiteration of it seems to be necessary—that there have been no negotiations whatever. We are not at present within sight of anything of the kind. Cardinal Mercier emphasises this as strongly as I do. They were private conversations about our respective history and doctrines, and nothing more. The critics of our action urge that before any such conversation can be rightly allowed to take place we ought to insist that the Church of Rome must confess the error of its doctrines and repudiate the declaration about Anglican Orders. Your lordships will, I am sure, agree with me when I say that to describe the conversations as being useless or harmful, unless we secure such a preliminary surrender, shows a fundamental misconception of what is meant by the sort of conversations which can be held in order to elucidate our

respective positions. Where should we be if, in all matters of controversy, conversations were to be pronounced useless or hurtful unless the conclusion, or even conversion, which on either side is hoped for has been already secured? Were we in this matter to reach at some future time a stage in which the word "negotiations" would be appropriate, I should certainly feel it to be essential that those who would then be going out as in some sense delegates or representatives of the Church of England should be men who represent the different points of view which have a legitimate place in the Church of England.'

There had been no departure from strict propriety, no suggestion of the possibility of any modification of the Anglican position, no hint at any sort of compromise. The action of the Archbishop had been diplomatic. He had refused ostentatiously to bar any door. He had, at the same time, carefully refrained from even the vaguest promise that any door might be opened.

The Malines Conversations came to an end. It was an open secret that the Anglican and Roman divines had, perhaps to their surprise, found themselves in almost complete agreement concerning Eucharistic doctrine. But the Archbishop desired that no report of the proceedings should be

published. Cardinal Mercier and the Abbé Portal both died, and Lord Halifax, approaching his ninetieth year and reasonably regarding Malines as a considerable triumph in his long-sustained campaign for reunion, grew impatient. By the publication of a summary of the proceedings he compelled the Archbishop to remove his ban, and to permit the issue, in the spring of this year, of a long, but obviously not complete, record. It was openly stated that the Archbishop had desired that this record should not be made public until after the fate of the Prayer Book Measure had been decided. He apparently believed that, when it was known that an Anglican delegation, that included a diocesan bishop, a retired diocesan bishop, a dean and the head of an Oxford College, accepted what to the Protestant 'underworld,' to use Dr. Hensley Henson's scornful phrase, was sheer papist doctrine, the Protestant opposition to the Prayer Book Measure in the House of Commons would be materially hardened. I think it was ; but, none the less, the postponement of the publication of the Malines report was extremely impolitic. It was clear that, sooner or later, the outside world must know something at least of what had happened, and that the Archbishop would be sharply criticised for holding back what

to his critics would seem evidence of dangerous developments within the Church, developments which made it the more necessary for Parliament to refuse its sanction to Catholic practices.

Over and over again during these last years the Archbishop has been the victim of circumstances which he could not control, and this is notably true of Malines. As he has explained, he could not forbid the conversations without a definite departure from the policy of the Lambeth Conference. He endeavoured to prevent anything like dramatic agreement by the selection of Dr. Gore, who of all Anglo-Catholics is perhaps the most definitely anti-Roman. He was convinced that, from the point of view of Lord Halifax, the conversations must fail. He may have wanted them to fail. I think he did. But, though they may have failed, they succeeded in emphasising the anti-Protestantism of a section of the Church of England—it should be remembered that, with the exception of Lord Halifax, all the delegates at Malines were definitely moderates—and this anti-Protestantism was made known at a moment when its repercussions caused the greatest possible mischief.

While he has obviously regarded the road to Rome as impassable, the Archbishop has, all

through his primacy, been intensely interested in the development of the friendship between the Anglican Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church which had its beginnings in the seventeenth century. The High Church movement has always looked to the East for the sympathy which it has never received in the West. The English Non-Jurors were in correspondence with the Eastern Patriarchs, and the Tractarians were keenly interested in the Eastern Church. The relations between the two communions have been discussed at Lambeth Conferences, and in 1920 representatives of the Œcumenical Patriarch conferred with Anglican divines. In more recent years the relations have become even more cordial, and the presence of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Alexandria at the Nicene celebrations in Westminster Abbey was an event of outstanding importance in ecclesiastical history.

Superficially, there is small resemblance between the two Churches. The Church of England is essentially and emphatically Western, and there is a world of difference between the Eastern and Western dispositions towards the Eternal Mysteries. But in the constant friction with Rome, with the formal denial by Rome of the validity of Anglican Orders, the formal recognition

by the Holy Synod of the Œcumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople that 'the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal communion of bishops, priests and deacons possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches' was of vast significance, and must have reasonably been regarded by the Archbishop as a triumph.

But, while the validity of Anglican Orders was admitted by Constantinople and afterwards by Jerusalem, there has not yet, except in a few isolated instances, been any authorisation for inter-communion, and the troubles over Prayer Book revision, the loud declarations that the Church of England is essentially Protestant, and the well-advertised modernism of Dr. Barnes and Dr. Inge, have increased the hesitation of Orthodox theologians and have postponed anything like actual union between the two communions.

It is perhaps inevitable that a man of the Archbishop's temperament, with his genius for diplomacy and his love for confidential and almost casual negotiations, should be compelled to consider every point of view, but he apparently has never realised that such modification of principle and concession of rigid doctrine, as would make the union of the Church of England with the

Protestant bodies that have seceded from it a possibility, must make union with the Orthodox East impossible. Emphasise the Protestantism of the Church, and Wesleyans and Congregationalists may perhaps return to it. Emphasise the Catholicism of the Church, and inter-communion with the East is a possibility, but it is impossible to do the two things and to achieve the two things.

But, while the reunion negotiations incident has been interesting and important, it is the protracted controversy concerning Prayer Book revision that has been the preoccupation of the closing years of the late primacy, and amid the complications that have resulted from the Prayer Book Measure's rejection by Parliament—complications not yet to be accurately estimated—the primacy has come to its end.

The Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure received general approval from the National Assembly in July 1923. Protracted debates took place in the Houses of Clergy and Laity throughout the next eighteen months, and it was not until October 1925 that the bishops met to consider the recommendations of the clergy and laity and to prepare the draft of what was to be known as the Deposited Book, 1927. The first of the long series of sittings of the House of Bishops was held

in public in the Church House, Westminster. It was opened by the Archbishop in a speech which concluded as follows :

‘ The task of criticising what we say will be very easy. Neither the mere retention of what is old nor the mere introduction of what is new can escape such criticism. Each school of thought has made its contribution to the material before us. Scarcely anyone will be completely satisfied by all that we say or abstain from saying ; but it is not we alone who realise this, and those who are now praying have themselves reminded us that they would lie open to a charge of insincerity were they to pray to God and yet not be prepared to leave the issue in His hands. I think—nay, I am sure—that I express the minds of all who are in this House when I say that we are looking quietly and confidently to those whose prayers will thus support us in a trustful resolve to act with straightforwardness and faith in doing what will, we believe, be right for our day and generation. In your name, therefore, I appeal to those outside to lay aside, for the time at least, the controversial spirit which has already, with perfect fairness, expressed itself abundantly. Surely nothing that could help us has been left unsaid.’

The Archbishop was perfectly candid. The

revision of the Prayer Book was not intended either to bring the practice of the Church of England into closer conformity with general Catholic practice or, on the other hand, to emphasise the differences that separate the Church of England from the Church of Rome. 'Each school of thought has made its contribution.' This meant, in effect, that something had been put into the Book to please everybody, with the idea of placating possible opposition and of securing general consent. The Catholic was to have his prayers for the dead; the modernist was to be no longer compelled to read the Athanasian Creed; the extreme Protestant could compose extemporary prayer. The intention of the Book was, indeed, the intention behind the consistent ecclesiastical policy of the Archbishop. Comprehensiveness must be maintained, and experience had convinced him that the maintenance of comprehensiveness was most likely to be secured by a combination of concessions and checks. When much is demanded it is wise to give a little, but only a little, while, at the same time, it is constantly repeated that everyone has a right to demand something. 'In providing a new Prayer Book,' wrote the Archbishop, 'we have perforce had to keep in our purview the

vigorous Anglo-Catholic, the staunch Protestant, and the anxious enquirers whose liberalism is equally foreign to both these sections.' Such a policy was naturally approved by Scottish common sense. On the face of it, it seems likely to work. But in a religious society, including men of strong and definite opinions, impatient of compromise, quite unable to affirm that 'shall' is synonymous with 'shall not,' partial concessions, dictated by policy and not based on any principle, are almost certain to defeat the end which they are intended to achieve.

It is a historic fact of considerable significance, and certainly not to be denied by any observer with inside knowledge of the various parties in the Church, that the bishops' proposals, when they were finally presented with formal dignity to the Convocations on Monday, 7th February, 1927, aroused no enthusiasm from any section of Church opinion. The extreme Protestants were violent in their opposition, and, though they count for very little in the Church, their influence was predominant in the House of Commons. The modernists were against the Book. Dr. Barnes voted against it. Dr. Major was against it, and Dr. Inge praised it with not very faint damns. Anglo-Catholic opinion was divided. Even those

Anglo-Catholics who supported the bishops did so reluctantly and with hesitation. The centre Churchmen—those safe and moderate men whom authority always holds in high affection—certainly voted steadily with the bishops. That is their habit, and, indeed, their *métier*. But even in these trusted ranks of Tuscany there was little inclination to cheer.

In speech after speech the Archbishop was emphatic that there were no doctrinal innovations or alterations in the bishops' proposals. In his speech on 27th February, 1927, he said :

'I wish to say emphatically that in my deliberate judgment nothing that we have suggested makes any change in the doctrinal position of the Church of England. The balance of emphasis may here and there be somewhat altered, but that mere fact will disquiet no one who remembers what different aspects of the truth have been emphasised by recognised Church leaders, even during the last four hundred years. The distinctive basis remains sure, and is enriched by the development of thought, the acquisition of fresh knowledge, and the upgrowth of new theories for the exposition of a truth manifold yet one and indestructible.

'If I thought that what we are suggesting

to-day would mean or involve any marked resetting of the distinctive position of the Church of England, I should not be standing here to advocate your acceptance of what we lay before you. My Churchmanship is the Churchmanship which has found it possible—yes, and desirable—to include Hooker and Jewel and Andrewes and Cosin and Waterland and Simeon and Keble, and I am persuaded that we are not departing therefrom to the right hand or to the left. And I remind you yet again that our proposals are permissive only, and that those who find in the old Prayer Book all that they desire can rest content in those pastures still.'

The Archbishop's accuracy cannot be questioned. The modified permission to reserve the Blessed Sacrament may imply the legitimacy within the Church of England of the doctrine of the Real Presence, but that doctrine has always been held in the Church of England, and in the Bennett Judgment the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council found that it might legally be taught. The Deposited Book contained prayers for the dead, but prayers for the dead have never been condemned or forbidden. As regards the much-discussed alterations in the Canon of the Mass, these alterations unquestionably brought the

Canon more into accord with the Greek liturgies and less in accord with the Roman Canon than the Canon in the Book of Common Prayer, and it cannot be doubted that they were due to the influence of the only expert liturgiologist among the bishops, who is, incidentally, an Anglo-Catholic. The Archbishop reasonably declared that the Roman doctrine is, in simple fact, more definitely excluded than before.

But, if there were no doctrinal changes, there was unquestionably in the new Book a change of emphasis. In many respects, and apart from the Mass, the new Book was far more acceptable to Anglo-Catholic opinion than the old. And this is very interesting because, as I have shown, revision was intended to suppress Catholic practices and Catholic teaching. It was demanded by Sir William Harcourt and the extreme Protestants, but, when the revision was completed and the bishops' proposals were promulgated, it was the extreme Protestants who were loudest in denunciation and opposition.

What, then, did the Archbishop hope that the Book would achieve? In his address at the opening of the joint session of the two Convocations on 20th March, 1928, he said :

'Here lies the Book, with all its faults, the product

of these many years of consideration and reconsideration since in its initial form it emanated, nearly eight years ago, from the Houses of Convocation whom I am now addressing. Its evolution and enrichment have, during these years, been a continuous process. Do you wish it to be made available for use, or do you relegate it to the limbo of endeavours which never come to maturity? Do you wish that it shall be open to priest and people to offer their prayers and praises in a form which we have striven—striven with our whole hearts—to make suitable to the conditions, the facts, the aspirations, of our own century? Or do you not? Let this Book come into use where it is wanted and as it is wanted, and you will be helping to weld into a worthier manner of worship, one in character and purpose, but varied in accordance with our varied needs and temperaments, the approach of all sorts and conditions of our people to the Lord Whom we adore. It will make for unity; it will make for order; it will make for peace.'

The Archbishop was concerned with 'the conditions, the facts, the aspirations of our own century.' What were these conditions, facts and aspirations so far as the Church of England was concerned? Steadily and persistently the

Anglo-Catholic party had grown in numbers and influence. They had been persecuted; they had been maligned; they had been misrepresented; they remained to a large extent boycotted when high preferment was vacant. But they could no longer be ignored. If the Protestant had his way, and the Catholics were driven out of the Church, the Church would suffer in enthusiasm, in piety, and in devotion to social service, a grievous loss which certainly no Archbishop could anticipate with equanimity. The ambition of Lambeth was to control; to direct; possibly, I would add, to hamper. The Deposited Book may have been intended to satisfy 'the aspirations of our own century,' whatever they may be, but it was intended far more to check the aspirations—certain of their critics would say the mediæval aspirations—of the Catholic party.

It was ruled in 1927 that the Assembly and the Convocations must accept the Book as it came from the bishops, or reject it, and no amendments and no detailed debate were permitted. Assent came from both bodies. In his speech before the voting in the Convocations, the Archbishop spoke eloquently and with deep feeling of the protracted work of the bishops in the library at Lambeth:

'I am certain that it is true to say that never

before in the history of the Church of England has there been a corresponding perseverance in laborious work on the part of virtually the whole diocesan episcopate, resolved to present for the acceptance of the Church their detailed conclusions upon what we may call every yard of our Prayer Book field.

‘ I believe that all of us would admit that the work and the thought and the fellowship and the prayers of these eventful weeks have brought us closer and closer together, with good augury for our fraternal fellow service in days which lie ahead. In reverence, I would add that the chapel hard by the room wherein we sat will for many of us furnish, while life lasts, the most potent and moving recollections of all. I am not so presumptuous as to claim Divine approval for every decision to which we came, but I am bold to say that the decisions were reached by men who sought, day by day, strength, courage and wisdom from on high, and who do not shrink from the distinctive responsibility which in the Church’s order belongs to the office which we hold.’

Throughout the summer and autumn of 1927 the Archbishop was busy replying to the raging Protestant propaganda and defending the proposals for which he had made himself responsible.

He repeatedly emphasised the 'enrichment' implied in the new proposals. He repeated that there had been no doctrinal changes. He sternly reproved the heavily subsidised Protestant agitation, scornfully referring to the people who were 'proud to show how many thousands they were spending.' He boldly demanded the loyal obedience of the faithful. The bishops had accepted, with full consciousness of its gravity, 'the solemn duty of taking action for which they were answerable both to God and to the Church.' They had given to their task immense labour and constant prayer, and in these circumstances they had the right to expect that their decisions should be accepted. 'When we are called upon to act, at a juncture like the present, we deliberately and confidently expect the loyalty due from members of the Church wherein a constitutional episcopate bears the trust of leadership and rule.'

In October 1927, six weeks before the Prayer Book Measure was submitted to Parliament, the Archbishop was compelled for the first time to express a personal opinion concerning the modernist teaching of the Bishop of Birmingham. Dr. Barnes was nominated to the see by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. It was the Labour Prime Minister's one important ecclesiastical

appointment. Mr. MacDonald is not a member of the Church of England, nor does he claim to have any extensive knowledge of its peculiar needs. Dr. Barnes, indeed, was not the first divine whom Mr. MacDonald selected, but when, as I understand, in one case there was a direct refusal, and in another a suggestion from Lambeth that the proposed clergyman did not possess the qualities necessary for a bishop, Mr. MacDonald not unnaturally chose Canon Barnes of Westminster, who, he knew, was esteemed for his learning outside the Church and who had strong sympathies with social reform. No appointment in recent years has been so tragically unfortunate, but it is the system of appointment and not the Minister that was to blame.

From his arrival in Birmingham, Dr. Barnes initiated an anti-Catholic campaign. In sermon after sermon he denounced the doctrine of the Real Presence as magical and superstitious, and was more concerned with the Gospel according to Darwin than with the Gospel according to St. John. Opposition came to a head when Canon Bullock Webster, an elderly clergyman of the most gentle disposition, made a public protest against the bishop's teaching during morning service in St. Paul's. The Archbishop naturally

condemned 'the unseemly incident.' But Dr. Barnes himself compelled him to a reluctant expression of personal opinion by the publication of an open letter, to which the Archbishop replied with delightful humour and astuteness. He reminded Dr. Barnes that vehement reprobation of his utterances had come, not from the unlettered pious, but from 'cultured men with scientific and philosophical as well as theological knowledge.' The letter went on :

'I believe that you overrate the adherence of thoughtful people to Creation theories of fifty to one hundred years ago, and I scarcely think that among those who listen to you there are a great number who hold the opinions which you satirise. For myself, at least, I can say that your position on the biological question, in outline and so far as I understand it, is one with which I personally have been familiar for more than fifty years. Believe me, this teaching, however admirable, is to most of us not novel, and I do not think that those who hear you on the subject with interest and advantage would recognise themselves as "wistful agnostics." As far as I can judge, it is not on what you have said with regard to that branch of science or theology that the attention of the thoughtful men has been

centred. It is too familiar. You may, I am certain, dismiss, my dear bishop, the fear that anyone in England desires to lead or drive you either to Rome or Tennessee.

‘The words which give rise to the sort of indignation I refer to are words which you use in dealing with the Sacrament of Holy Communion. It is on what you have said respecting Sacramental doctrine that intelligent and large-minded Churchmen, lay as well as clerical, have approached me day by day.

‘I have an intense dislike to the use of the daily Press for the discussion of such subjects. I purposely refrain from trying in such a letter as this to discuss the profound and life-giving doctrines involved, but, of course, I am more than ready to go into the matter with yourself at any time, should you so desire. But your open letter forces me, however reluctantly, to some reply. Formally and publicly you invite me “to consider what steps can be taken to help those of us who are giving of our best to fit the Church to be in the future the spiritual guide of an educated nation.” That is a large and difficult matter, needing time and care, but I can say at once that, in my judgment, one of the first steps is to secure the scrupulous use of the most careful language

possible in dealing with doctrinal matters of deep solemnity, which affect the devotional thoughts and prayers of Christian people. That duty, obligatory upon every Christian teacher, is peculiarly incumbent upon us bishops, who have to weigh the effect of our words upon all sections of the great body to whom we desire to be fathers in God. We promise on our consecration day "to be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word," and while, as you have truly said, "smooth, unctuous platitudes" are not enough, yet in all the range of our duties there is none which calls more clearly for the exercise of tender and fatherly carefulness in word and act.

' Now in your open letter to myself you assure me that what you have been lately doing, and have been denounced for doing, is as "a bishop of the Church of England" to "uphold its traditional Sacramental doctrine," and to "affirm"—as we all affirm—that "the doctrine of Transubstantiation is untrue." Do not suppose me to be unmindful of our duty to stem whatever trend there is that way. The duty is clear. But when I turn to the Birmingham sermon which aroused criticism I find that the statement you make to me fails to describe fairly what you there

said. In your natural and legitimate desire to denounce a few in the Church of England who hold or teach the doctrine of Transubstantiation, you were led to speak of the Sacrament of Holy Communion in a way which—quite reasonably, as I think—gives real offence to the great body of devout Churchmen and Churchwomen, and not least to those who are able to give scholarly as well as reverent consideration to the Sacramental doctrines which our Church upholds.

‘I do not believe that you had any intention of wounding the souls of honest and faithful English Churchmen, but you ignore or belittle the position and teaching of those within our Church who stand in the tradition of such English bishops as Andrewes or Ken or Wilson, or, in our own day, Edward King or Charles Gore. Nay, more, your words seem to me to be capable of being so interpreted as to include in reprobation, or almost in contempt, the position of the great mass of Churchmen who would associate themselves with the teaching of such leaders as, say, my own great masters, Bishop Lightfoot or Bishop Westcott, or who have caught the devotional spirit of the hymns of Charles Wesley.

‘I prefer to think that if you re-read your Birmingham sermon in the light of such criticism

as your letter has drawn from me you will feel that what I have said is not unfair.

‘ You say in your letter that your teaching is “ positive and unreported.” Your Birmingham sermon, however, contains some such positive teaching. And, as I read your words about the grace of our Saviour’s Presence through the whole act of worship, they leave me wondering whether, if you were to consider what are their implications, you would not find further cause to modify the width and scope of your negative and destructive statements.’

Never was a diocesan bishop more sternly reproved. But the reproof was Davidsonesque. He qualified his censure—fatally qualified it—in assuming, without the smallest reason, that Dr. Barnes had not meant what he said.

The Prayer Book Measure was introduced into the House of Lords on 16th December, 1927, and Dr. Davidson opened the debate. I reprint here the impression of his speech that I wrote immediately after it was delivered :

‘ The Archbishop was not at his best. He spoke with little of the forcefulness that he has shown in speech after speech in the Church Assembly and the Convocations. Although at the beginning his voice was strong and resonant, he was hoarse

and almost inaudible before the end. He spoke, indeed, much too long. His speech lasted an hour and a quarter, and it would have been infinitely more effective if it had been compressed. While acknowledging the right of Parliament to interfere with the decisions of the Church Assembly, there was a certain implied resentment that the power to interfere should be used, and, as it appeared to me, his Grace yearned for the days when the secular authorities would have given consent to ecclesiastical decisions without argument or debate. He continually referred to the "enrichment" that the Prayer Book had brought to the services of the Church. Enrichment is, I confess, a word that has come to make me squirm. The early part of his speech was, however, clear in its statement. Speaking very deliberately he said :

“ You have had abundant literature from those who oppose us in this matter. It is urged on you that I, and those who are associated with me in bringing forward this Measure, are doing, by the Book, all sorts of dreadful things. It is said that they, and I, as Archbishop, are false to our ordination vows ; that we are flouting the teaching of the Bible and of the Reformed Church ; that we are renegades, and are contravening the

whole principle of the Reformation ; and that I am subtly trying to bring back into English homes the obscurantism and error from which the Reformation set England free. It is really startling to learn—interesting, important and significant ; I treat it with great respect—of the funds which are flowing into the coffers of those people in order that such a mass of literature may be circulated. I heard a story of £10,000 in the last few days being added to other funds for the circulation of that kind of literature. So be it !

“ The attack has been largely against myself. I am an old man. I have been a bishop nearly thirty-seven years, and an Archbishop for nearly twenty-five years, and my life has not been lived in private or silently ; and I assure your lordships to-day that I am absolutely unconscious of any departure from the principles of the Reformed Church of England, to which I declared allegiance fifty-three years ago and which I have striven to maintain ever since. If I thought our proposal was calculated to controvert or to impair those principles, I should not be standing here. But I believe nothing of the kind. When I read that flood of literature, I rubbed my eyes and looked afresh at the Measure to find where are the points to which these vituperative epithets can properly be applied.

In all seriousness I ask myself whether those arguments are not preposterously overstrained, and are not distorted altogether from the true proportion, and whether the writers of that literature are not using deliberately inflammatory language of a quite inapplicable kind."

' His Grace proceeded to recapitulate the oftentold history of the last twenty-one years. He declared that it was inexact to talk of the Bishops' Book and the Bishops' Measure. The proposals before the House were the work of the clergy and the laity represented in the Church Assembly ; but his Grace did not refer to the many changes made by the bishops after the final meetings of the clergy and laity. He had no difficulty in ridiculing the absurd charges that have been made concerning the prayers for the King, and his repudiation of any attempt on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities to challenge or to minimise the royal supremacy aroused the first sedate cheer of the sitting. As for the prayers for the dead, they had never been condemned by the Church of England, and their necessity had been emphasised by the war.

' Coming to the Holy Communion, the Archbishop, again, speaking with emphasis and solemnity, said :

“ It is extremely difficult to discuss here adequately, because deep doctrines are being dealt with, though I do not think they are being affected. I am, however, most ready to meet any challenge with regard to the doctrinal significance of anything in the new Book in contrast with the old Book. I cannot go into the doctrine of the Presence of our Lord on the floor of the House, but it must not be supposed that I am shirking the issue. I am ready to meet it at the right time and in the right place. Very great care is needed in all discussions on this matter, because of the fact that abuse of what is right in regard to the Service of Holy Communion is the very thing that may quite possibly lead to superstition of a grave kind. When it is asked why any change was wanted, I reply that it is constantly forgotten how great is the change now in regard to the usage of, and the frequency of, participation in Holy Communion on the part of tens of thousands of parishioners to-day. I am not saying whether it is right or wrong to multiply the celebrations of Holy Communion and the frequency of participating in Holy Communion, but it is the fact that many thousands of parishes and many thousands of parishioners are now in the habit of having celebrations perhaps every day in

the week, certainly many days in the week, and certainly of communicating many days in the week."

' This was perhaps the most effective passage in the speech. Going on to consider the rubric that permits the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the Communion of the Sick, the Archbishop said that he would make a statement that he had never before made in public. He himself had wished that no such permission would have been found necessary. He thought that the cases that it was intended to meet had been considerably exaggerated, but that, after considering all that can be urged in its favour, he was compelled to take another view. "I was convinced otherwise by the evidence." But he went on to make it perfectly clear that, so far as he was concerned, the restrictions of the rubric would be insisted on to the letter. There was a certain emphasis in his reminder that a bishop's licence would be necessary before a priest could reserve at all. The Archbishop made his own position perfectly clear. He has given a half-unwilling assent to Reservation for the Communion of the Sick. He will apparently resolutely refuse any extension, however necessary or however inevitable it may become.

‘ Returning to a consideration of the Book as a whole, his Grace urged that it would make for peace. Loyalty, he said, far from decreasing, had increased in the Church. Priests were willing to obey, only they wanted to know definitely what they had to obey, and he instanced the representatives of the thirteen hundred Anglo-Catholics who, led by Bishop Gore, had come to him with assurances of obedience. And so he proceeded to a peroration, felicitous in expression, but extremely difficult to hear :

‘ “ As my last word, I would take the still larger ground of saying that the giving to us of this Book would mean the liberation of the Church from the great mass of those petty strifes which have troubled us up and down the country in the past, and would conduce to the Church’s firm progress towards doing better the work to which we long to give ourselves whole-heartedly together both at home and overseas. Therefore, I beg your lordships to put aside technicalities, important as many of them are, and to realise the vast issue which may turn upon the vote you give. We have talked about rubrics and special prayers and differences of view—all important questions—but, in my opinion, there is a larger issue at stake than any of these. The Church of England,

for which I am spokesman to-night, has a trust immeasurably great and sacred. From the depths of our hearts we want to use it aright. We want to use for the bettering of English life every ounce of strength which by God's benediction is ours. We want that strength so consecrated and united that it shall be irresistible for all that we desire in our country's life. For years we have been weakened and distracted by strife and argument on sacred things, which within our borders have been keeping men apart. Thank God, there has been of late—I say this with absolute certainty—a growing resolve to attain a firmer unity. The hour has come when these hopes and endeavours may reach some measure of realisation.

“ The Church of England has, to use a rough phrase, pulled itself together, and the central cohorts of men and women who really care—the men and women who, when they say their prayers and think about sacred things, use the Church's service for their aid—have united in asking for the enrichment of our common worship with a view to obtaining fresh strength for our common work. You, my lords, may turn down our request if you like. I do not believe that you will do so. I am sure you will abstain from an act which

would be confusing and disheartening to us all. Disregard the clamour, the inevitable clamour, of a section on either side. Earnest men and women as they are, they fail to see the great significance of our united purpose and resolve. Regard rather, my lords, the meaning of our eager and reiterated wish, alike in central assemblies and in every diocese in the land. We shall use it, God helping us, to His glory and the people's good. For twenty-five years it has been mine to bear the central burden of responsibility. An hour has come, which I have never known before, when up and down the land we await your decision as to whether or not we are to be thus armed for united advancement, inspired and uplifted by united prayer. From my heart I ask you to give us our earnest wish by passing the resolution."

'The House of Lords does not cheer, but the Archbishop sat down to a subdued rumble of "Hear, hears."'

The Archbishop's own position in the Reservation controversy was made quite clear. In a few cases, and in unusual circumstances, he had permitted Reservation in his own diocese. But he had wished that no general permission would have been found necessary. He admitted that he had been convinced by the evidence and against

his will. In his pamphlet, *The Prayer Book : Our Hope and Meaning*, the Archbishop repeated that Reservation had been made necessary by 'the steadily growing desire for very frequent reception of the Holy Communion.' But he added : 'I see dangers as well as advantages in the usage, which has now become widespread, of very much more frequent reception of Holy Communion than used to be enjoined.'

But Reservation was to be permitted solely for the Communion of the Sick, and then only in special circumstances. He wrote :

'The rubric is so drawn as to make clear that it is simply the extension, in exceptional cases of a particular kind, of the usage which the preceding rubric sanctions, and that it applies only in the special circumstances of a particular parish. Evidence seems to show the existence of such exceptional cases for which exceptional provision must be made.'

'Evidence seems to show.' The Primate apparently still had his doubts. But he was steadfast in his loyalty to comprehensiveness. 'We must in honest fairness,' he wrote, 'make room for those who maintain—and quietly and deliberately they do maintain—the genuineness of the need for some form of Reservation for the

Sick, the legitimacy of their desire, and the possibility of reasonably satisfying it.'

The debate in the House of Lords went on for two days, and was interminably dull, Lord Carson making an unexpected appearance among the Protestant stalwarts, and the Bill passed the Lords, to be thrown out next day in the House of Commons.

The Archbishop sat over the clock from the beginning to the end of the Commons debate. I was within a few feet of him throughout the whole sitting, and I can say without hesitation that there is absolutely no truth in the stories of tears and emotions when the figures of the division were announced. Hour after hour he sat, almost motionless, with a stern, rather weary detachment. He sat, indeed, quite alone, and, after the division, he walked out of the gallery alone, to be joined outside by the Archbishop of York, not in the least a figure of pathos, but a strong, stubborn, stern old man, temporarily defeated, but even then determined to fight on. I have often been moved to admiration by the Archbishop, but never so much as on that December evening, when the work of years seemed to have been destroyed in an outburst of ignorant Protestant fanaticism within the House, while a little crowd

of forty or fifty people stood in the street in the rain and sang the doxology out of tune.

The House of Commons division gave, in a sense, the greatest triumph to the Archbishop since the beginning of his primacy. With the exception of the extreme left wing, the whole Church was indignant at the affront offered to it by Parliament. The State had, for the first time, assumed the right to dictate doctrine. Most of those Anglo-Catholics who had hitherto professed their inability to accept the restrictions of the Measure and the Book were now ready for greater sacrifice, and were eager in their assurance that they would loyally support the bishops, if they firmly and strongly resisted the State's attack on the rights of the spirituality. The loyalty and the unity which the Archbishop had demanded had been secured for him by the curious majority of Scottish Presbyterians, Welsh Calvinists and black Protestants from Ulster who, with the help of a Parsee and a Christian Scientist, had thrown out the Prayer Book Measure.

The Archbishop had the greatest opportunity of his career. If he had acted promptly and courageously he could at Christmas 1927 have secured the spiritual independence possessed by the Scottish Kirk, without necessarily or even

probably running any risk of disestablishment. If, indeed, he and the bishops had acted then as they have acted within the past few weeks, the whole situation must have been vastly different. The Archbishop missed his chance. He was the victim of his unconquerable yearning for compromise. He apparently believed that it was possible to secure Parliamentary approval for the Book by making certain unessential alterations, and this desire led him into a hopelessly illogical position. When, after many meetings, the bishops produced their revised proposals contained in the Schedule to the Prayer Book Measure, 1928, it was found that the changes, for which the Archbishop himself was mainly responsible, and which had been, as is commonly known, opposed, not only by the few Anglo-Catholic diocesans, but also by several of the most authoritative of the middle bishops, were calculated to estrange the Anglo-Catholics and to lose a large part of the support that the action of the House of Commons attracted, while at the same time far too little had been conceded to propitiate the Protestant majority in Parliament. It had been realised that a generous administration of the Reservation rubric, as it appeared in the 1927 Book, might, in the course of years, have made Reservation almost

as common in the Church of England as it is in the Church of Rome. The conditions, insisted on by the bishops, could have been accepted as necessary for seemliness and reverence, and the appeal from the diocesan to the province would have made such arbitrary action as that of Dr. Barnes in Birmingham troublesome, if not impossible. But the new rubric was worded in such a way as to ensure that Reservation should be the exception, and the situation was further aggravated when the Bishop of Winchester wrote to *The Times* to say that this was the intention of the episcopate.

The Archbishop was in a dilemma. Convocation had approved the 1927 rubric, and it was, therefore, necessary for him to affirm that there was really no great difference between the two enactments, and that the latter merely served to make clearer what had always been in the bishops' minds. On the other hand, it was hopeless to expect that Parliament would reverse its decision unless it could be persuaded that the Measure, as sent back by the bishops, had been changed in important particulars. As was inevitable, neither suggestion found acceptance. The Convocation, as is its wont, politely accepted what was offered to it, but the majority of Anglo-Catholics openly declared that the bishops had sold the pass, and

that they had been sacrificed to Sir William Joynson-Hicks. The House of Commons, on its side, regarded the alterations as of no moment, and rejected the Measure by an even larger majority than before.

To have sent back the Book with any provision, however restricted, for continuous Reservation, was an extraordinary political blunder. It could not have been a matter of any great difficulty to have arrived at the mind of the House of Commons. Over and over again the Archbishop has shown great political sagacity. He has an experience of Parliament only rivalled by that of Lord Balfour. It is amazing that he should have supposed that the Measure would have succeeded at the second attempt. Tremendous issues were at stake. A reversal of the settlement between State and Church was a possible consequence of repeated Parliamentary opposition to the will of the Church. If the Archbishop had any doubts, it was foolhardy to run risks. And he had doubts, for in April he took the extreme Erastian course of seeking directly to influence House of Commons votes. He advised that 'all incumbents in the diocese, who conscientiously can, should, by means of the parish magazine and even the pulpit, do their utmost to explain matters to their people

fairly and justly between now and the time when the Measure is likely again to come before Parliament. Where opinion is shown to be decisively in favour of the Book, the Member of Parliament for the division is, I think, entitled to be informed, and ought to be informed, of the fact.'

While the fate of the Measure was still in doubt, the Archbishop celebrated his eightieth birthday. Whatever may have been his preoccupations, whatever fear he may have had, he was in a particularly gay and happy mood when he made a long speech, charming in its humour and its felicity of phrase, at a luncheon given to him by the Institute of Journalists, and he was full of happy memories on the occasion when he received the honorary freedom of the city of Canterbury. He recalled the fact that he had been on intimate terms with ten Prime Ministers, of whom six or seven had been his close friends. He had numbered, too, hundreds of bishops among his friends, and the burden of responsibility to which he had been born had been alleviated by constant kindness. He believed intensely, he said, in the strength of the link which joins the religious and civic life of a city.

An Archbishop, he said, was far less lucky than a Cabinet Minister, who sometimes was able to

go out of office, and enjoy a period of less responsibility and more freedom in which to think of the mistakes that he had made and to determine not to make them again. There was no such breathing-space for an Archbishop. From the time of his appointment he was always in office, with the heavy burden of responsibility upon his shoulders.

Both in State and Church it was difficult to find really first-class men to hold prominent offices. The shortage of clergy was a source of constant anxiety. He was told sometimes that in civil life there was a similar shortage of men who could be counted on to fulfil to the satisfaction of everybody the duties that were laid on them. This was an effective *tu quoque*. The Archbishop has frequently insisted that the children of this world suffer from quite as many and quite as glaring defects as the children of light.

CHAPTER X

‘ INTO THE CORRIDOR OF LIFE’S EVENTIDE ’

IN his eightieth year, and in the twenty-fifth year of his primacy, the Archbishop’s active career has come to its end. His service to the Church has been of incalculable value. He has maintained the Church’s prestige, and has prevented its disruption, at least for our time. But he has given it no new enthusiasm. He has inspired no fresh and daring crusades. The Archbishop is a man of abounding courage and stubborn determination. He has never hesitated to accept responsibility. He has never felt any urgent need for the support of his subordinates. He has never feared to trust his own judgment. But he is no adventurer. The most obvious of his qualities is caution, and the cautious man inevitably hesitates, negotiates, and, maybe, compromises, before he attempts to initiate any bold or novel policy. The Archbishop has always faced the facts. And the great spiritual adventurers have generally ignored the facts.

The realism of the Archbishop's outlook on life has been, as it has seemed, of immense service to the Church, and to this same realism may be traced the broadening and widening of sympathy in his own character. As a young priest he was bred in Tait's super-Erastianism. Tait believed that the ministers of the Church of England were servants of the State, pledged to obedience to the State, sharing the status of, and only of a little greater account than the Secretary of the Treasury or the permanent head of the Foreign Office. That must have been very much how Mr. Davidson thought of Archbishops and bishops when he went to Lambeth as Tait's chaplain. The Church was a department of a Christian State. Fifty years have passed, and almost the last official action for which the Archbishop has been responsible was the declaration of the bishops, issued on Friday, 29th September, in which, in somewhat halting phrases, they declared their intention to ignore the resolutions of the House of Commons and to permit practices sanctioned by the Prayer Book Measure which Parliament deliberately refused to accept. It has been almost pathetically pleaded that there is no intention to flout the will of Parliament, but, in effect, the youthful Erastian has become an elderly rebel—an

extremely polite and regretful rebel, but a rebel none the less.

From the death of Tait until the death of Queen Victoria, Dr. Davidson was a courtier priest, trusted by his royal mistress, accepting, apparently with patience and even pleasure, the harassing experiences that all courtiers, even when they are priests, have to endure. But, as Scott Holland pointed out, Dr. Davidson was that rare courtier who contrived to preserve his independence of mind, his sanity of outlook, and the captaincy of his soul. With the years he became interested in social reform, with courage enough to support those of his suffragans who demanded justice for the miners and an equitable peace in the great strike of 1926, and far more concerned with the needs of the poor than with the troubles of the rich.

The Archbishop has never had any stomach for ritual. The elaboration of the services which has marked the Catholic revival must be irritating and meaningless to him. He repeated with great satisfaction before the Royal Commission that neither Pusey nor Newman was a Ritualist in the modern sense. But again he has faced the facts, and has learned that ritual has its significance and for a certain type of mind its very great

value, and he has been ready to approve what years before he condemned.

The Anglo-Catholic can hardly claim that Dr. Davidson has developed in his direction. His principles are very definite, and they have remained constant. He is convinced that disestablishment would mean de-Christianising the nation, and that the State would lose immensely if it no longer paid even formal homage to the Catholic religion in accepting the principle of an established Church. The Church cannot remain established unless it is to a very large extent comprehensive. Like all other sane men, he knows that comprehensiveness must have its limit. The Archbishop has always believed that a very definite limit must be imposed on the troublesome people who teach that regular confession is a Catholic duty, who construct High Mass out of the Prayer Book Office of Holy Communion, and who impregnate their churches with the smell of incense. He has been much less decided concerning the development of the Modernist thinkers who 're-state' the Catholic Creeds. But he has come to realise that the Church cannot afford to lose either the learning or the parochial enthusiasm of the Anglo-Catholic clergy. He must have bitterly regretted their eccentricities,

but the eccentricities must be endured in order that the enthusiasm may be exploited. There is no real inconsistency in his career ; merely the astuteness of a gifted leader of men who knows exactly when he cannot drive and where he must cajole.

It is no conviction of failing power that caused the Archbishop to resign his high office. He did not profess, he said at the Mansion House, to be a completely outworn man, or unable physically or mentally to tackle a particular task. He has not resigned on account of ‘disappointment at recent events in Parliament.’ It is the super-importance of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 that has convinced him that he must give way to a younger man. ‘When the bishops of the Lambeth Conference meet in Canterbury Cathedral in the summer of 1930,’ he has said, ‘they must meet under the leadership of men who have themselves wrought the preparation for that great gathering. When that Conference is over, those same men must be at the helm, if God will, for busy years of what will, I think, be anxious but most interesting and faithful work. That work will, in no ordinary degree, if I mistake not, demand the robust statesmanship of men who to profound faith and capacity add forces

of brain and fibre for daily and nightly use after a fashion not forthcoming from a man who has fourscore years and more behind him. I do not stand here as a man disheartened by disappointment, or as a man whose health has, in the ordinary sense, broken down. But I am convinced—and the conclusion, infinitely trying to myself, was not lightly reached—that for the coming years of quite exceptional work, with the Lambeth Conference at their core, you must look to younger leadership than mine if the work is to be coherent, consecutive, and, in the truest sense, progressive in the Church's life.'

It would not become me to make more than the barest reference to the charm of Dr. Davidson's personal character, to the felicity of his personal life, or to the debt he owes, frequently publicly acknowledged by him in these later days, to the gracious lady whom he married fifty years ago. His intimate personal friendships have as often been with the undistinguished as with the highly placed, and none of his friends has anything but the deepest gratitude for an understanding that is always acute and for a sympathy that has no qualification. During the war, for example, a large number of V.A.D.'s, working at St. Thomas's

Hospital, lived at Lambeth Palace, and were treated as the Archbishop's guests. Kindliness has been the note of his life, as it is the outstanding characteristic of his wife. It has been said of them that no two people highly placed, and with their days filled to overflowing with duties and responsibilities, were ever more ready to suffer fools gladly—not merely patiently, but gladly.

The Archbishop's intimate friendships have included men of all professions and many opinions. He has been extraordinarily well served by his chaplains, and he has a genius for understanding exactly to whom to go for advice and information on the many subjects and problems with which he has been concerned. It is one of the small misfortunes of his life that he has rarely had an intimate personal contact with the Anglo-Catholic clergy, the one conspicuous exception being Dr. Gore, with whom he has been for many years on terms of the closest and most affectionate friendship. Mr. Athelstan Riley, one of the prominent Anglo-Catholic laity, is another of his friends, and, despite their wide differences of opinion, he has for Lord Halifax the sincerest admiration. Here goodness has called to goodness.

So, unperturbed, undaunted, inspired with the faith for the future, Archbishop Lord Davidson passes into 'the corridor of life's eventide.'

'I am an old man, and we are told that old men dream dreams. My dreams for the world I shall soon be leaving are rich in hope.'

INDEX

A

ADDINGTON PARK, 7, 109
Agnus Dei, 50, 125
 Anglo-Catholics, 8, 46, 99, 103,
 142, 161, 187, 207-8, 210,
 212, 231-3, 240, 243
 'Appeal to all Christian Peoples,'
 154-7, 196
 Assyrian Christians, 36-7
 Athanasian Creed, 129
 Atlay, Bishop, 43

B

BALFOUR, MR. A. J. (LORD
 BALFOUR), 110, 158, 234
 Barnes, Bishop, 146-7, 150-1,
 203, 207, 214-16, 220, 233
 Battifol, Monseigneur, 193
 Beaconsfield, Lord. *See*
 DISRAELI
 Belloc, Mr. Hilaire, 181
 Benefices Bill, 99
 Benham, Canon, 32
 Benson, Archbishop, 12, 16-21,
 23-6, 29, 31-2, 36-41, 43-7,
 53-6, 70, 81-2, 89-91, 93-5,
 97-8, 102, 112-13
 Benson, Mr. A. C., 17, 26, 47, 91
 Birrell, Mr. Augustine, 182
 Blomfield, Bishop, 73
 Blunt, Rev. Mr., 15
 Book of Common Prayer, 4, 9,
 43, 97, 99, 102, 127, 129, 139,
 158-9, 161-2, 210

British Museum, Sunday open-
 ing, 67-9
 Browne, Bishop, 17-22
 Burial Bill, 12
 Butler, Dr., 55

C

CAIRNS, LORD, 2
 Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.,
 183
 Carey, Bishop, 178
 Carpenter, Bishop, 27
 Carson, Lord, 230
 Cecil, Lord Hugh, 158
 Celebration without communi-
 cants, 87, 128, 131
 Church Association, 39, 123
 Church, Dean, 1, 17, 46
 Church Discipline Act, 132
 Church Missionary Society, 136
 Church overseas, 10, 115-16
Church Times, 40, 46, 70, 81,
 113, 156
 Clarke, Sir E., 121
 Clergy Discipline Act, 70
 Colenso controversy, 8
 Confession, 2, 9, 10, 99, 104-5
 Connor, Dean, 27, 31
 Convocation, 4, 65-6, 89, 100,
 122, 130, 160, 194-5, 207, 212,
 233
 Court of Arches, 10
 Creighton, Bishop, 100, 107

D

DANKWERTS, MR., 42
 Dartford, curacy at, 1, 7
 Davey, Sir H., 42-3
 Davidson, Mrs., 8, 11, 242-3
 Deceased wife's sister, marriage
 with, 32-5
 Deposited Book, 6, 46, 100-1,
 189, 200, 204, 206, 210-12,
 224-6
 Dibdin, Sir Lewis, 10, 121, 158
 Disestablishment, 61, 63, 240
 Disraeli, 3, 24, 98, 181
 Dolling, Father, 84-8, 103, 112-
 13
 Drury, Bishop, 121
 Duchesne, Abbé, 92-4

E

EASTER, VOLUNTEER CAMPS AT,
 65
 Eastern Churches, 36, 190, 202
 Eastward position, 4, 50, 123
 Ecclesiastical Discipline Com-
 mission, 100
Edinburgh Review, 161
 Education Acts, 88, 115, 182
 Edward VII, 32, 36, 106-7, 183
 Ely, Lady, 14, 18
 Enabling Act, 159-61
 English Church Union, 43, 103,
 161-2
 Evangelicals, 46
 Exchange of pulpits, 96

F

FISHER, MR. H. A. L., 184-5
 Frere, Dr., 158, 193

G

GARDINER, MR. A. G., 98, 100
 Gasparri, Cardinal, 93
 Gasquet, Cardinal, 93
 General strike, the, 169, 172, 239
 Gibson, Bishop, 120
 Gladstone, 12, 16-17, 20-2, 24,
 27, 28, 38, 50-1, 63, 181
 Gore, Dr., 1, 59, 142, 147, 152,
 193, 197, 201, 219, 243
 Greek Orthodox Church, 82
 Green, Rev. S. F., 4, 5, 12, 17
 Grimthorpe, Lord, 37
Guardian, 4

H

HALDANE, LORD, 159
 Halifax, Lord, 54, 90, 92-4, 105,
 191, 193, 200-1, 243
 Harcourt, Sir W., 88, 98-101,
 104, 120, 210
 Hatcham, St. Catherine's, 71
 Haweis, Rev. H. R., 96
 Headlam, Dr., 189
 Headlam, Mr. Stewart, 59
 Henson, Bishop Hensley, 141-3,
 147, 152, 160, 200
 Houses of Laymen, 130

I

INCENSE, 99, 101-2, 129, 240
 Inge, Dean, 203, 207
 Ingram, Bishop Winnington, 1
 Inskip, Sir T., 2
 Ireland, Church of, 63

J

JOYNSON-HICKS, SIR W., 2, 234
Judicial Committee of the Privy
Council, 4, 40, 45-7, 123, 209

K

KEBLE, 121
Kidd, Dr., 193, 197
Kikuyu Conference, 136-7
King, Bishop, 39-41, 43-4, 83,
123, 219
Knox, Bishop, 160

L

LACEY, CANON, 93
Lambeth Conferences, 8-11, 31-2,
37, 89, 97, 134, 138, 152-3,
158, 189, 201-2, 241
Lambeth Hearing, the, 102-3
Lang, Archbishop, 1
Lansdowne, Lord, 177
League of Nations, 179
Leo XIII, 92-3
Liberal Party, 50, 82, 98, 182,
184
Liddon, Canon, 1, 9, 10
Life of Archbishop Tait, 32
Lightfoot, Bishop, 47, 219
Lincoln Judgment, the, 2, 39,
46-50, 95, 123
Lloyd George, Mr., 61, 63
Longley, Archbishop, 8
Lowder, Mr., 124

M

MACDONALD, MR. RAMSAY, 146,
214

Mackay, Prebendary, 178
Mackonochie, Father, 5
Maclagan, Archbishop, 101, 110-
11
Major, Dr., 150-1, 207
Malines Conversations, 90, 156,
189, 191-2, 197, 199-201
Mercier, Cardinal, 191, 193, 195,
198, 200
Mitchell, Mr. Rosslyn, 3
Mixed chalice, 123, 128
Modernists, 150, 240

N

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, 130, 158,
160-1, 168, 204
National Mission of Repentance
and Hope, 177-8
Nestorian Church, 36
Newman, Cardinal, 1, 96, 121,
239
Nonconformists, 58-9, 114, 148,
155-7, 161, 182, 190, 195, 198

O

OLD CATHOLICS, THE, 11
Open church, the, 61-2
Orders, Anglican, 91-4, 98
Ornaments Rubric, 4, 122

P

PAPAL BULL, 94, 97
Parmoor, Lord, 158
Peckham, Archbishop, 140

Penzance, Lord, 3, 5, 10
 Phillimore, Lord, 43
 Ponsonby, Sir H., 13, 27, 32
 Portal, Abbé, 90-4, 191, 193, 200
 Prayer Book. *See* BOOK and
 DEPOSITED
 Prayers for the dead, 105, 126,
 209, 223
 Processional lights, 101-2
 Public Worship Regulation Act,
 2, 3, 5, 30, 100, 123, 132, 163
 Puller, Father, 93
 Purchas Case, the, 122
 Pusey, Dr., 1, 72, 121, 161, 239

Salisbury, Lord, 53, 75, 107
 Scott Holland, Canon, 59, 88, 239
 Selborne, Lord, 158-9
 Shaftesbury, Lord, 2
 Social problems, 59, 60, 167, 239
 Society for the Promotion of
 Christian Knowledge, 36, 180
 Spurgeon, 64
 Stanley, Dean, 1, 45, 72, 160, 189
 Stanton, Father, 84
 Stations of the Cross, 85
 Stone, Dr. Darwell, 151
 Stubbs, Bishop, 43, 47
 Suckling, Father, 5
 Sunday cycling, 66

R

RAMPOLLA, CARDINAL, 92-3
 Raymond, Mr. E. T., 63
 Reformation, the, 94, 99, 121,
 149, 222
 Reservation, 97, 99, 128, 131,
 163, 225, 228-9, 232-3
 Reunion, 93, 153-5, 157, 200
 Riley, Mr. Athelstan, 243
 Rochester diocese, 56, 76-8
 Rosebery, Lord, 63, 113
 Royal Commissions, 11, 104,
 112, 120-4, 127, 130-2
 Runciman, Mr. W., 184
 Russell, Mr. George, 7
 Russian Coronation, 82

S

SABBATARIANISM, 66-70
 St. Aldwyn, Lord, 120
 Saintsbury, Professor, 64

T

TAIT, ARCHBISHOP, 2-8, 10-20,
 23, 29, 30, 39, 50, 89, 90, 95,
 111, 115-16, 118, 148, 238-9
 Tait, Mr. Craufurd, 7, 11
 Temple, Archbishop (Frederick),
 7, 43, 94-7, 101, 106, 108-9
 Temple, Archbishop (William),
 1, 169
 Thicknesse, Prebendary, 185, 187
 Thorold, Bishop, 43, 57, 75, 85-6
Times, 99, 111, 233
 Tooth, Rev. Arthur, 3
 Tractarians, 2, 9, 16, 46, 121-2,
 161
 Transubstantiation, 98
 Tristram, Dr., 42
Truth, 84

V

VAUGHAN, CARDINAL, 92-3
 Vaughan, Dean, 16, 55

Vestments, 4, 121, 123, 125
Victoria, Queen, 2, 3, 6, 12-14,
18-22, 24-9, 31-2, 37, 51,
54-5, 83-4, 105-7, 239
Von Hügel, Baron, 93

W

WACE, DEAN, 142
Wafer bread, 4, 123
Wales, Church of, 63
War, the Great, 175-80, 242

Ward, Mr. W. G., 96
Warman, Bishop, 152
Webster, Canon Bullock, 215
Wellesley, Dean, 12-13, 15
Welsh disestablishment, 63
West Indian dioceses, 11
Westcott, Bishop, 7, 38, 47, 219
Weston, Bishop (Zanzibar),
134-5, 137-8, 141, 151-3,
156-8, 191
Winchester diocese, 76, 79
Wordsworth, Bishop, 43

BX
5199
D25D3

Clark
Archbishop Davidson
+ the English church

874758

ENT 14 31
MAR 18 74

G B Switzer
Table 123

2- 12512

2- 12512

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



48 451 076

